

AN HISTORICAL
TREATISE

WRITTEN
By an AUTHOR of the Communion
of the CHURCH of ROME.

TOUCHING
Transubstantiation.

WHEREIN
Is made appear, That according to the
PRINCIPLES of That CHURCH,
This DOCTRINE cannot be an
ARTICLE of FAITH.

William The Second Edition. *Walker*

L O N D O N,
Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the Rose and Crown
in S. Paul's Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVII.

AN HISTORICAL
TREATISE

WRITTEN
By an AUTHOR of the Communion
of the Church of ROME.
Touching

Transubstantiation.

WHEREIN
is made appear, That according to the
Principles of The Church,
This Doctrine cannot be an
Article of FAITH.

The second Edition.

LONDON,
Printed by Robert DODD, at the Royal-Graven
in a New Church-Yard, 1711.

THE PREFACE.

IT is well known that there are in the Communion of the Church of Rome, a great many Learned Persons, that do not approve of all which it teacheth, and that do earnestly long for a Reformation, although they remain within its bosome. But it is no less true that there's but very few, that have the courage to make their thoughts known, and 'tis no hard matter to guess at the Reasons of it.

In the last Age, one Picherel, and some others of great note, wrote solid Treatises on certain matters of Controversie, and explain'd themselves just as Protestants do now. And in the present, Monsieur de Marca did the same, on the Doctrine of the Eucharist, and Barnes, an Eminent Benedictine, on most of the principal Questions wherein Protestants differ from the Church of Rome. But as if every one feared such usage as Father Paolo, and poor Barnes found, for the Liberty they had taken, the works of these sincere and learned Men, have almost always been suppress'd during their Life-time, and not suffer'd to come abroad till after their Decease.

It is therefore something more than ordinary, to behold the Work of a Person now living, and of the Communion of the Church of Rome, that dares shew the like affection for the Reformation of his Church in the Doctrine of the

The Preface.

Eucharist, and that heartily wishes, the Bishops and Clergy of France, would take it into their serious consideration. This Person is considerable for his Quality, but much more for his great Learning. He was an intimate friend of the late Monsieur de Launoy's, a noted Divine of the Faculty of Paris, who mightily desired to see a free Council, wherein Men might speak their thoughts touching the Reforming of the Romish Church; and it plainly appears he was of the same judgment with this Eminent Person, touching the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

The Reader may rest assured that the Author's Manuscript Copy has been exactly follow'd in the Edition of this Work; which not only his Letters, now in our Hands, will justify, but also the Original of these Papers, which he sent to a Friend to be Printed.

It is to be hoped the World will not take it ill, if the Author of this Work be not more particularly described, which could not be done without exposing him to the malice of those who use all manner of ways to destroy such of their party, as do own the Truth. It nearly behoves the Bishops and Clergy of France, to make some serious Reflections upon what the Author thought fit to represent to them concerning Transubstantiation. The same might have been said to the other Articles of the Romish belief, which are rejected by Protestants, as so many additions to the ancient Faith of the Primitive Christians; which are impos'd upon Mens consciences by the Clergy, by such unheard-of ways, and that are so contrary to the nature of Religion. If such Remonstrances as these, are not of sufficient force to make them change their proceedings against Protestants; they will at least serve to shew their Injustice before Men, and will one day aggravate their condemnation before the Tribunal of God.

THE CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Method proposed by the Assembly of the Clergy of France to judge of Articles of Faith.	Pag. 1.
This Method admitted by Protestants.	2
Transubstantiation to be Examined by it.	ib.

PART I.

THAT several of the Doctors of the Church of Rome have
confess'd that *Transubstantiation* is no ancient Doctrine. 3

So Suarez.	3	Tonstal, Bishop of Durham.	ib.
Scotus.	ib.	Cassander.	ib.
D'Allisaco.	ib.	Ch. du Moulin.	ib.
Card. Cusa.	ib.	J. Tribarne.	ib.
Erasmus.	ib.	Monf. de Marca.	ib.
Alphonfus à Castro.	4		

PART II.

THAT the Ancients did not believe *Transubstantiation*.

Proved :

The Contents.

Proved:

In GENERAL.

First, The *Papists* themselves confess, that *Transubstantiation* is not expressly mentioned not taught in Scripture. 5

So, <i>Scotus.</i>	ib.	<i>Gabriel Biel.</i>	ib.
<i>Ockham.</i>	ib.		
<i>Alphonfus de Castro.</i>	ib.	<i>Card. Cajetan.</i>	ib.

Secondly, That *Transubstantiation* comprehending infinite difficulties, we do not yet find that either the *Jews* or *Gentiles* have objected any thing to the *Christians* in their disputes against it. ib.

Not	} Trypho. Celsus. Julian.	}	ib.

Who yet have traduced most of the Mysteries of our Religion. 7

Which plainly shews that *Transubstantiation* was not then known. ib.

In PARTICULAR.

Transubstantiation was not believed by any of the Fathers of the Church. This shewn in those of the several Ages,

CENT. II.		CENT. IV.	
<i>Justin Martyr.</i>	8	<i>Eusebius.</i>	16
<i>Irenaeus.</i>	9	<i>Eusebius Caesariensis.</i>	ib.
<i>Clement Alexandr.</i>	10	<i>Cyrillus Hierosol.</i>	17
<i>Theodotus.</i>	ib.	<i>Atacharius.</i>	ib.
CENT III.		<i>S. Basil.</i>	18
		<i>Ephrem Edessenus.</i>	ib.
<i>Tertullian.</i>	11	<i>Epiphanius.</i>	19
<i>Origen.</i>	13	<i>Gregorius Naz.</i>	ib.
		<i>Gregorius</i>	

The Contents.

403

<i>Gregorius Nyssen.</i>	20
<i>S. Ambrose.</i>	21
<i>Gaudensius.</i>	22
<i>S. Chrysostom.</i>	ib.

CENT. V.

<i>S. Jerome.</i>	26
<i>S. Austine.</i>	27
<i>Theodores.</i>	37
<i>Alnobius Jun.</i>	38
<i>Prosper.</i>	ib.
<i>Hesychius.</i>	39
<i>Procopius Gazens.</i>	ib.
<i>P. Gelasius.</i>	40

CENT. VI.

<i>Fulgentius.</i>	41
<i>Ephrem Antioc'h.</i>	ib.
<i>Facundus.</i>	ib.
<i>Primasius.</i>	42

CENT. VII, VIII.

<i>Isidorus Hispalensis.</i>	43
<i>Beda.</i>	44
<i>Sedulius.</i>	ib.
<i>Jo. Damascenus.</i>	ib.
<i>Concil. Constantinop.</i>	45
<i>Alcuinus.</i>	46
<i>Carolus M.</i>	47
<i>Officium Ambrosianum.</i>	ib.
<i>Ordo Romanus.</i>	ib.

CENT. IX.

<i>Theodorus Studita.</i>	48
<i>Alyto.</i>	ib.
<i>Theodulphus.</i>	49

<i>Rabanus.</i>	51
<i>Amalaricus.</i>	52
<i>Walafridus Strabo.</i>	54
<i>Heribald.</i>	ib.
<i>Trudegard.</i>	55
<i>Ratramne.</i>	ib.
<i>Jo. Erigena.</i>	56
<i>Prudentius.</i>	58
<i>Christian Drummar.</i>	ib.
<i>Florus Diacon.</i>	60

CENT. X.

<i>Alferic, A. B. Cam.</i>	61
<i>Wolphinus.</i>	ib.
<i>Saxon Homil.</i>	ib.
<i>Fulcuinus.</i>	62
<i>Herriger.</i>	ib.
<i>Monast. Cluny.</i>	ib.
<i>Ratherius.</i>	63

CENT. XI.

<i>Auth. Life of S. Gemilphe.</i>	64
<i>Leuthericus.</i>	ib.
<i>Fulbertus.</i>	ib.
<i>Berno.</i>	65
<i>Bruno.</i>	66
<i>Gregory VII. P.</i>	ib.
<i>Theophylact.</i>	67
<i>Nicetas Pectoratus.</i>	ib.
<i>Chronicon Malleac.</i>	ib.

CENT. XII.

<i>Honorius.</i>	67
<i>Rupertus.</i>	68
<i>Zonaras.</i>	ib.
<i>Amalaricus.</i>	ib.

CENT.

The Contents.

CENT. XIII. &c.

Of the Council of Lateran.

That several after it did not believe *Transubstantiation*.

Guido le Gros.	69	Albert. M.	72.
Reginald Peacock.	70	Durand.	ib.
Guido Cluv.	71	Cornelius Bp. of Bitonte.	ib.
Jo. of Paris.	ib.	Dominicus Bannes.	ib.

CONCLUS.

To the Clergy of France, that they ought not to press upon the Protestants the belief of *Transubstantiation*.

72

AN

404

AN HISTORICAL
TREATISE
OF
Transubstantiation.

Written by one of the
CHURCH of ROME.

THE Bishops of France in their last Assembly held at Paris in the year 1682. compos'd a Pastoral Letter addressed to the Protestants, to invite them to return to the Communion of the Church of Rome. And because in order to put an end to their differences in Matters of Religion, some Rule must be agreed on to be received by the different Parties; they laid down several Principles which they called *Methods*, as fit to be made use of, whereby to judge what should be received as an *Article of Faith*. The Clergy of France's Method to judge of Articles of Faith.

In the Fourth *Method* they laid down as a *Maxim*, that the true means to discern what relates to matter of Faith, or not; is to see if the Article which is to be admitted, was always believed as Matter of Faith; that is to say, that the French Bishops admitted in their pastoral Letter, the Maxim which *Vincentius Lyrinensis* left us above 100. years ago; That great Care must be taken to retain in the Catholic Church, what hath been believed every where, by all, and at all times, as being the true Means whereby to discern what is Matter of Faith, and what is not. This same is the Rule given by Pope Pius the Fourth, who obliges them to swear in the profession of Faith, added to the Council of Trent,
That

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

¶ *Secundum
unanimem con-
sensum Patrum.*

That the Holy Scriptures should not be Interpreted, † But by the unanimous consent of the Ancient Fathers.

Admitted by
the Prote-
stants.

The Protestants have thought this Maxim so reasonable, that Monsieur Larroque a French Minister, saith in his Preface to the *History of the Eucharist*, that he believes there is no Man of Sense, but ought to admit of it. And it was received as a Rule of Faith by the Reform'd Church of England, by Philip Melancthon, by Peter Martyr, Gallasius, Scultetus, Casaubon, Grotius, Vossius, Buxa, and by Gessellius, who recites their Authorities, in the Preface of his *History of Memorable things from the Creation of the World, to the year of Christ, 1125.*

Transubstan-
tiation to be
examined by
it.

Seeing therefore that the Bishops of France have propos'd to us so just a *Admonition*, let us examine if the Doctrine of Transubstantiation be a Doctrine of Faith, and prove it, and because the Council of Trent has defin'd it so; Or that the Council of Lateran in the year 1215, suppos'd it to be so, non quia ipsam quam tenemus fidem commendaverit Milevitanis Optatus, vel Mediolanensis Ambrosius, aut quia Collegarum Nostrorum Conciliis ipsa predicta est, saith S. Austin against the Donatists, *De unit. Eccles. cap. 16.* But because 'tis contain'd in the Holy Scriptures, and understood in that Sense by the unanimous consent of the Doctors and Councils that have gone before us.

¶ *Secundum
unanimem con-
sensum Patrum.*

This is what we now undertake to perform by the assistance of God's holy Spirit, and with a disposition of Mind free from all Malice and Prejudice, according to what Caesar saith in *Salust*, in the beginning of the Book of *Cataline*, *Omines homines qui de Rebus dubiis consultant, ab ira & odio vacui esse debere, & haud facile animum pervidere verum, ubi illa officiant.* And St. Austin upon the Book against the Letter of the Manichean, by them called the Letter of Foundation; *Ut autem facilius miscatis, &c. nemo nostrum se jam queramus quasi ab utrisque nesciat, ita enim diligenter & concorditer queri poterit, si nulla temeraria presumptione inventa & cognita esse credatur.*

But not to over-burthen this small Treatise with too great a number of Arguments or Citations, we will chiefly examine two things; First, *Who those Catholick Doctors are, that believed the Doctrine of Transubstantiation not to be ancient.* Secondly, *If what those Doctors have writ be true: And whether we can indeed produce sufficient Authorities to believe that the ancient Church did not hold nor believe it.*

PART I.

IN the first place, That there have been Catholick Doctors which have taught, that *Transubstantiation* is no ancient Doctrine, * *Snarez* formally asserteth it, although indeed he saith, their Opinion ought to be corrected. The truth is, *Peter Lombard* Master of the Sentences, saith expressly, *Si queras qualis sit illa conversio, an formalis, an substantialis, an alterius generis, definire non audeo.* Several Doctors of the Church of Rome have believed the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* not to be very ancient.

Secondly, † *Scotus* saith, That there were formerly three Opinions touching the changing the Bread into the Body of Christ, the first of which held that the Bread remain'd in the Eucharist. In the Paragraph, *quantum ergo ad istum articulum, &c.* he saith, that at present the Church of Rome holds *Transubstantiation*. Nunc autem ipsa tenet (Sancta Rom. Ecclesia) panem transubstantiari. † *Scotus* in And a little under, he saith, *adversum ubi stat vis, dicendum quod Ecclesia declaravit istum intellectum esse de veritate fidei, in illo Symbolo edito sub Innocentio tertio in Concilio Lateranensi.* And since this Declaration made by this Council held in the year 1215. it is an Article of Faith. *Tenendum est esse de substantia fidei, & hoc post istam declarationem solemnem.* * *Bellarmino* doth own that *Scotus* did believe *Transubstantiation* was no Article of Faith before the Council of *Lateran* under *Innocent* the Third; but he adds, that 'twas because *Scotus* did not know of the Council held under *Gregory* the Seventh, and that he had not read the Authorities of the Fathers which saith *Bellarmino*, I have now recited.

Thirdly, † *Peter Dayly*, Cardinal and Bishop of *Cambray* saith, It doth not clearly follow from the Determination of the Church, that the substance of Bread ceaseth, therefore he doth not believe this to be the ancient Doctrine. † *P. Dayly* on 4th Sent. q. 6. Art. 4.

Fourthly, * *Cardinal Cusa*, Excit. l. 6. Sermon. 40. *Super una Oblatione, consummavit, &c.* saith, That there were some ancient Divines which did not believe *Transubstantiation*. * *Card. Cusa*.

Fifthly, † *Erasmus* in his Notes on the First to the *Corinthians*, saith, That it was late ere the Church established *Transubstantiation*. † *Erasmus*.

Alphonſus à
Caſtro Lib. 8.
contr. Heret.
† Tonſſal Lib.
1. of the Sa-
crament.

* Sixthly, *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, ſaith, That the ancient Writers very ſeldom ſpake of *Transubſtantiation*.

Seventhly, † *Tonſſal* Biſhop of *Durham* about the middle of the laſt Century, ſpeaking of the *Breads* being changed into the *Body of Chriſt*, ſaith, It were much better to leave it to the Liberty of Chriſtians to believe as they pleas'd, of the manner in which this change is made, as it was practis'd in the Church, before the Council of *Lateran*.

Caffander.

Eighthly, *Caffander* in his Conſultation with the Emperour *Maximilian* the Second, touching the differences of Religion, confeſſeth that *Transubſtantiation* is a Novelty, and that 'twere much better to keep to the terms of the Ancients; that the Abuses therein, approach near to Idolatry.

Du Moulin.

Ninthly, *Charles du Moulin*, the Oracle of the French Civilians, upon the *Edicts and Ordinances of France*, againſt the Injuries of *Popes*, Num. 406. ſpeaks in theſe Terms; *Innocent* the Third, forged, or at leaſt eſtabliſhed it as a general Article of Faith, and as neceſſary to be believed by all, as that of the holy Trinity, the *Transubſtantiation* of the Bread and Wine into the true Body and true Blood of Jeſus Chriſt.

Jo. Tribarne.

Tenthly, *John Tribarne* a Spaniſh Divine, in the 4th. Sent. Diſt. 11. q. 3. Diſp. 42. S. 1. ſaith, That in the Primitive Church it was matter of Faith, that the Body of Jeſus Chriſt was contain'd under the Species of Bread and Wine, but that 'twas not any matter of Faith to hold that the ſubſtance of Bread was changed into the *Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt*, and that it ſubſiſted no longer after Conſecration.

De Marca.

Eleventhly, *Monſieur de Marca*, Archbiſhop of *Paris* in his poſthumous Diſſertations, ſaith, in his French Treatiſe of the Sacrament of the *Eucharift*, That until *S. Chryſoſtom's* time, it was believed the Bread was the Body of Jeſus Chriſt by a marvelous change that comes on the Bread; but that it becomes united to the incarnate Word and to his Natural Body, the Bread not changing its Nature, and yet not going into the Draught; which is a kind of pious conſideration which he added againſt *Origen*.

PART II.

AS for the *Second Point*, which is to see if there is effectively to be found in the Writings of the Ancients, sufficient Authorities to believe that the Ancients did not believe Transubstantiation.

Before I alledge their Authorities, two Reflections may be made.

First, that our own Authors do observe, that Transubstantiation is not expressely mention'd nor taught in the Scriptures. *Q. 1.* The Papists confess that * *Scotus* cited by *Bellarmino*, of the Eucharist, *Lib. 3. cap. 23.* it is not expressely in Scripture. So

This is my Body, that the Bread is transubstantiated. *† Ockham* saith of Transubstantiation, that it cannot be proved by natural Reason, nor by Authority of the Bible, but only by the Authority of the Ancients. *† Scotus.* *† Ockham.* *Lib. 4. q. 34.*

* *Alfonsus de Castro* disapproves what *Ockham* says, That it can be proved by the Authority of the Ancients, for he saith, That it was not to be found, no more than Indulgences were, in the Writings of the Ancients. ** Alfonsus de Castro.* *Vocabulo Indulgentie.*

Gabriel *† Biel* speaking of Transubstantiation, saith, That it is not expressely taught in the Holy Scriptures. *† Biel.* *Lect. 40. in Can. Miss.*

Cardinal * *Cajetan* does not find the words of Jesus Christ This is my Body, clear, neither for the Real Presence, nor for Transubstantiation, without the determination of the Church be joyned to them. ** CAJETAN* *in 3. p. 8.* *Th. 9. 75.* *Art. 7.*

The second Reflection, is that Transubstantiation comprehending a great many Difficulties quite contrary to natural Reason, none of the Jews nor Pagan Philosophers, disputing against the ancient Christians, ever dream'd of making any objections against it in their Disputations. *Trypho* the Jew charges us with things monstrous, incredible, and strangely invented; as what we teach of Jesus Christ's being before *Aaron*; and *Abraham*, that he took on him our Nature, that he was born of a Virgin, that

Obs. 2. None of the Pagans objected to the ancient Christians the difficulties of it. Not *Trypho*.

God should be born, be made Man; that we should adore a Man, that we should put our trust in him, and that we should invoke another God besides the Creator, all this appears in S. Justin Martyr, in his *Dialogus* against Trypho.

The Pagans reproach us for saying God has a Son, that this Son should appear in humane shape, and they stile it the Follies of the Christian Discipline; that God should be born, and that he should be born of a Virgin, and be a God of flesh, crucified and buried; The last Judgment, the pains of eternal Fire, the Joys of Heaven, the Resurrection of the Dead. All this appears by Clement of Alexandria *Stromat.* l. 6. by Tertullian his *Apologet.* ch. 21. 47. in his *Treatise of the Flesh of Christ*, ch. 4. and 5. And in his *Treatise of the Testimony of the Soul*, ch. 4. By S. Justin in his second *Apology*, and Arnobius in his second Book.

Nor Celsus.

* L. E. & 2.

contr. Cels.

Celsus, in * Origen, scoffs at the Incarnation, as of a thing unworthy of God. In the Sixth Book, he laughs that we should believe God should be born of a Virgin. In the Third and Eighth Book, he saith of Christians, That they honour with a Religious Worship even above all Religion, a Man that was a Prisoner and that suffered Death. He even thereby pleads for the plurality of his Gods: as if Christians were not satisfied in worshipping one God, under colour that they adored Jesus Christ; If Christians, saith he in the Eighth Book, worshipped but one God, they might have some colour to despise others. But they pay infinite Honours to him that has but very lately appear'd, and yet they don't think they displease God when they serve and honour his Minister.

Nor Julian.

Julian the Apostate oppos'd the Mystery of the Incarnation, the Divinity of Jesus Christ, the Salvation he purchas'd for us by the price of his Blood; he reproaches us with the glorious Title of Mother of God, which we give to the Blessed Virgin; he contests the Mystery of the Trinity of Persons and Unity of Essence, accusing us of contradicting Moses, who said, There is but one God. He reproaches us for Baptism; See, saith he, what Paul saith to them, that they are sanctified and cleansed by Water, as if Water could penetrate to the Soul, to wash and purifie it; Baptism can't so much as cleanse a Leper, nor a Scurf, it cannot heal a Cancer nor the Gout. He aggravates what we read, that God Visits the Iniquity of the Fathers upon the Children, thereby to endeavour to attack the Doctrine of Original Sin. He boldly questions what God saith in the Book of Numbers touching

Phineas

Phineas, that thrust his Javelin through the Body of an *Israelite* that committed *Folly* with a *Midianitish Woman*, which turn'd away *God's Anger* from the *Children of Israel*, and hinder'd him from consuming them. *Let us suppose*, saith he, *that there had been to the Number of one Thousand that had attempted to have transgressed the Law of God, ought six hundred Thousand to have been destroy'd for the sake of one Thousand; it seems to me to have been much juster to have saved one ill Man with so many good ones, than to involve so much good Men in the ruine of one bad one.*

There's scarce any of our *Mysteries* that have not been censur'd by the *Jews* or *Pagans*; yet 'tis very strange that not one should accuse us of admitting in the *Eucharist*, accidents without substance, whiteness without any thing that's white, roundness without any thing round; weight without any thing that's weighty; a corruption whereunto the species are subject, without any thing that's capable of being corrupted; a Nourishment in the Symbols, without any thing that can nourish; a power in the Wine to be smelt without any thing that may be smelled. No body ever reproach'd us with so strange a thing, that a Man with one word should destroy a substance which he holdeth in his hands, and that nevertheless against the testimony of all the Senses, I see that which is no more; I feel that which I do not feel, I taste that which I do not taste, I understand that which I do not understand; I touch that which I do not touch, that I should be nourished with nothing; that my taste should be delighted with nothing; that my Eyes and Ears should be struck with Nothing.

The three Reflections we have hitherto made, That many of the antient Catholick Doctors have not believed *Transubstantiation* to be antient, That they have Judged it could not evidently be deduced from the *Holy Scriptures*; and, That the antient Pagan Philosophers have not reproach'd us with it, are three very strong Suppositions to make us mightily doubt the Antiquity of this Doctrine. But to shew evidently that 'twas but in the last Ages that this opinion was made an Article of Faith, we need only consult the Doctors of the Primitive Church, and see if they have effectively explain'd the *Eucharist* by the *Systeme of Transubstantiation*.

Hence it follows, that *Transubstantiation* was not antient.

That

AGE II

Just. Mar-
tyr.

That the Fathers of the SECOND CENTURY
did not believe Transubstantiation.

Apol. 2.

mark
This

S. Justin Martyr saith, "That after the common Prayers were ended, there was presented to the chief of the Brethren, which was God's Minister, the Bread and the Wine, mixt with Water, which he receiv'd into his hands, and giving thanks and glory to the Father of Heaven and Earth, through Jesus Christ his Son, and the Holy Ghost, &c. and the said President or Minister having ended his thanksgiving, the People bearing all said Amen, those whom we call Deacons and Ministers, attending on this Holy Service, give to every one present at the Holy Communion, part of this Holy Bread, so blessed and glorify'd; and also of the Holy liquor mixt of Wine and Water, upon which Prayers had been made. And a little lower, "Behold, Lord, we do not receive this Bread nor this Wine as common Bread and Wine, but as Jesus Christ is become Flesh and Blood by the Word, so also the nourishment which by the Word is become a Sacrament, and of which by conversion and change, our flesh and Blood are nourish'd, is as we have learned, the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ incarnate.

If St. Justin had believed that the substance of the Bread, Wine, and Water had been changed after Consecration, so that they had been destroy'd, how could he have said, that after Consecration the Deacons did distribute to the People the Bread, the Wine, and the Water?

Secondly, When he saith, we do not take this Bread and Wine as common Bread and Wine: this language amongst the ancient Doctors intimates, that both the one and the other do still subsist, but that by Consecration, they have acquir'd a new use and quality. As when Cyril of Jerusalem Catech. 3. Ad Illum. saith, Approach not to Baptism as to common Water. Or as Gregory Nyssen saith of Baptism, Do not despise the Holy Font, and look not upon it as common Water.

To conclude, this blessed Martyr saith, Our Body and Blood are nourish'd by the change of the Eucharistical food, which converts and

and turns it self into our Flesh and Blood. These words plainly shew, that 'tis the Bread and Wine which are turn'd into our Substance, into our Flesh, and into our Blood, seeing that 'tis certain, that the real Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ, is not converted into our Flesh and Blood. So when *Justin* saith, That the Sacramental Food is the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, that imports, that 'tis not common Bread and Wine, but a Bread and Wine which is to be consider'd as the Flesh and Blood of the Word incarnate.

AGE ii.

Justin Martyr.

S. *Irenaeus* proves against *Valentines* and his followers, that our Bodies shall not be destroy'd, and by consequence that they shall be raised incorruptible by receiving the Sacrament, as the Bread of the Eucharist becomes supernatural by the invocation of the Holy Ghost.

Irenaeus

We establish in the Eucharist, saith S. *Irenaeus*, the Communion and unity of the Flesh and of the Spirit; for as the Bread which is of the Earth, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common Bread, but is the Sacrament compos'd of two things, one Terrestrial, and the other Celestial: So also our Bodies which receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, but have the Hope of a future Resurrection. Adversus Haereses. l. 4. c. 24.

This passage doth suppose, that the Bread remains in the Eucharist; in the first place, because if Consecration did destroy the substance of the Bread and Wine, it must be confess'd the Holy Doctor had taken wrong measures, to shew that the Flesh is not destroy'd by the grace of the Holy Spirit, by the Bread of the Eucharist, which it self should be destroy'd by the grace of the Spirit which comes upon it.

Secondly, Because a little before, *Irenaeus* saith, How is it they say, the Flesh shall be destroy'd and turn to corruption, seeing it is nourish'd with the body and blood of Christ?

Now the Flesh is fed by the conversion of nourishment into the body, which not being to be said of Jesus Christ, is only to be apply'd to the Bread. Moreover these words, That the Eucharist is compos'd of two things, sufficiently shew, that the Bread remains; for to say *Irenaeus* means by a Terrestrial thing, the accidents of Bread & Wine, besides that S. *Austin* saith in the second Book of *Sermones*, Chap. 12. that 'tis a thing monstrous to say that accidents subsist without a subject; *Irenaeus* also himself saith, Book 2. cap. 14. that Water cannot be without moisture, Fire without heat, a Stone without hardness. For these things are so united, that the one cannot be separated from the other, but the one must subsist in the other. So in like manner, by this Terrestrial thing must be understood,

understood.

AGE ii.

Irenaus

understood the Bread, as S. Gregory Naz. saith in his fourth Oration according to Basilus his version, Baptism also is compos'd of two things, Water and the Spirit; the one is visible and is meant in a corporal manner, but the other is invisible and operates after a spiritual manner; the one is Typical, the other cleanseth that which is inward, and most hidden.

Clem. Alexand.
Pedag. l. 2.

Clement of Alexandria saith the same in different terms. The Blood of Christ is twofold, the one is carnal, whereby we are deliver'd from corruption, the other is spiritual, whereby we are anointed, and that is to drink the Blood of Jesus Christ, to be partakers of the incorruption of the Lord. Now the virtue of the Word is the Holy Spirit, as the Blood is the virtue of the Flesh. By Analogy then, the Wine, mixt with Water, as the Spirit with Man; and this mixture makes the Wine the pleasanter to drink, but the Spirit leadeth to incorruption. Now this mixture of the one with the other, to wit, of the Wine and the Word, is called Eucharist, which is highly esteem'd, whereby those who worthily partake of it by Faith, are sanctify'd both in their Body and Soul.

Grace
negot
signifies mix-
ture.

When Clement of Alexandria said that the Eucharist is a mixture of Wine and the Word, it is a composition, a mixture, which could not be, if there was but the Word only in the Eucharist. For a mixture is at least of two things. So the Fathers have called Jesus Christ, a mixture of God and Man. The Body of Man, saith S. Austin, is a mixture of Body and Soul; the Person of Christ is a mixture of God and Man.

S. Austin Ep.
3. ad Volusian.

Theodorus.

The Epitome of Theodorus saith, The Bread and Oyl are sanctified by the virtue of the name, and they remain not what they were before, though to look on them they seem to be the same, but by virtue, they are changed into a spiritual force. So water sanctified is become Baptism, it not only retains what's left, but also acquires a sanctification.

The author saith, The Bread is changed, but when he adds that 'tis into a spiritual virtue, he quite excludes the change of its substance; for by virtue, and spiritual, cannot be understood any other change but that of virtue and quality, seeing this Author speaks of this change, as being common to the Water of Baptism, to the Oyl of Unction, and to the Bread of the Eucharist.

That the Fathers of the THIRD CENTURY AGE iii.
did not believe Transubstantiation.

Tertullian in his first Book against *Marcion*, shewing that *Tertullian*.
Jesus Christ is not contrary to the Creator, as this Heretick affirm'd, saith in his 14th. Chap. *Hitherto Jesus Christ has not condemn'd the Water wherewith he cleanseth his Children, nor the Oyl wherewith he anoints them, nor the Hony nor the Milk wherby he makes them his Children, nor the Bread by which he represents his body.*

By this passage, the Bread represents the Body of Jesus Christ, therefore the Bread remains in the Sacrament, and this Bread is not really Jesus Christ, because what doth represent, is another thing than what is represented.

Two things have been said on this place of *Tertullian*; first, that the Bread signifies the accidents of Bread; the second that the Word represent, does signify in this place, to make present: As when in a Court of Justice a Prisoner is made appear as often as he is demanded.

Against the former, there's no reason to believe that *Tertullian* speaking of Water, of Oyl, of Hony, and Milk, should intend to speak of their accidents, but of their very substance, and that speaking of Bread, he should speak only of its accidents.

Against the second it's most certain that in matter of Sacraments, the term to signify is taken literally, to signify. *S. Austin* saith, Ep. 5. the signs, when applyed to Holy things, are called Sacraments. *Tertullian* explains himself clearly Lib. 3. against *Marcion*, so that there's no cause of doubting, when he saith, That Jesus Christ has given to the Bread the privilege of being the figure of his Body. The same *Tertullian* lib. 4. contra *Marcion*, cap. 40. doth prove that Jesus Christ had a real Body, and not one in shew only, as *Marcion* dream'd, and he proves it by this argument: That which hath a figure ought to be real and true;

AGE iii.

Tertullian.

now Jesus Christ hath in the Eucharist a *figure* of his *Body*, therefore the *Body* of Jesus Christ is *real* and *true*, and not a *Phantom*.

Jesus Christ, saith Tertullian, having taken the Bread which he distributed amongst his Disciples, he made it his *Body*, saying, *This is the figure of my Body*: now it had been no *figure*, if Jesus Christ had not had a *real* and *true Body*; for an empty thing as a *Phantasm* is, is not capable of having any *figure*.

From hence 'tis concluded, that the Bread being the *figure* of the *Body* of Jesus Christ, and that which is a *figure*, being distinguished from the thing *signified*, the Bread of the Eucharist is not properly and truly the *Body* of Jesus Christ, and so the Bread is not destroy'd, but remains to be the *figure* of the *Body* of Jesus Christ.

If it be said, the Bread is destroy'd, and that the accidents of Bread are the *figure* of the *Body* of Jesus Christ, this gives up the victory to Marcion, to prove, that Jesus Christ had a *true Body*, and not one in *show* only, because Jesus Christ hath in the Eucharist the *figure* of Bread, which is Bread only in appearance. Marcion might have retorted the argument and said, according to you, Tertullian, the Sacrament is the *figure* of the *Body* of Jesus Christ; now as this *figure* is Bread in appearance, and is called Bread only because of the outward accidents and qualities which it retains, so also the *Body* of Jesus Christ was only a *Body* in appearance, and was called a *Body* because it had the outward accidents and qualities.

Again, as Tertullian saith, That Jesus Christ distributed to his Disciples the Bread which he had taken to make it the *figure* of his *Body*; it is most certain he took true Bread, and by consequence, that he distributed true Bread.

The same Tertullian in his Treatise of the Soul, disputing against the Academicians that questioned the truth of the testimony of the Senses, saith to them, that we must not at all doubt of the testimony of the Senses, lest occasion might farther be taken to doubt the actions of the humanity of Jesus Christ, that it might not be said, That it was untrue that he saw Satan fall from Heaven; That it was not true, that he heard the Father's voice from heaven bearing witness to his Son; That

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

X13

AGE III.

Tertullian.

That he was deceived when he touched *Peter's Wife's Mother*; That he was deceived when he smelt the sweet odour which he was pleas'd to accept for the preparation to his Death; or, That he tasted the Wine that he consecrated in remembrance of his Blood.

It is evident that to consecrate *Wine* in remembrance of *Blood*, cannot be understood of a *substance* which is destroy'd all saving the *accidents*; This manner of expression in the language of the Ancients signifying no more, but that a substance remains always in its first state, only attains to a higher degree, which is, to be the Sacrament of a Heavenly and supernatural thing. To conclude, if *Tertullian* had believed that the Wine had been destroy'd, and that nothing but the appearance was left, against the testimony of all the Senses, had it not been an unpardonable fault in *Tertullian*, to prove that the Senses could not be deceived by the Example of the *Eucharist*, where the Senses are quite deceived?

Origen did not believe *Transubstantiation* when he said in his Commentary on the 13th. Chap. of *S. Matth.* expounding these words of the Gospel, *what enters into the Mouth*

Origen.

"defiles not the Man &c. as there's nothing that's impure of it self

"to him that's polluted and incredulous; but a thing is impure,

Du Plessis

"by reason of his impurity and incredulity; so also, that which

saith on this

"is sanctified by the word of God and Prayer, doth not sanctify

passage, Christi-
ans, stop your

"by its proper nature, him that uses it: If it were so, it would

Eats.

"also sanctify him that eats unworthily of the Lord, and none

"should have been weak, nor sick, nor should have fallen asleep,

"by reason of so eating——. If all that enters into the Mouth

"goes into the Belly, and there is cast out into the draught, this food

mark

"which is sanctified by the word of God, and by Prayer, goes

"also into the Belly and is cast out into the draught, according to

"its material substance; But according to the Prayer which has

"been thereunto added, it becomes profitable according to the

"measure of Faith, by causing the mind to become enlightened,

"having regard to what is profitable; And 'tis not the matter

"of Bread, but the words which have been pronounc'd upon it,

"that avails him which eateth in such a manner as is not unwor-

"thy of the Lord, and this may be said of the Body Typical, or

"Symbolical; Many things might be said also of the Word made

"Flesh,

"Flesh, and true nourishment, the which whosoever eats shall never
 "dye, and which no wicked person can eat; for could it be that he
 "which continues wicked should eat of the Word incarnate, seeing he
 "is the Word and Bread of Life, it would not have been written,
 "Whosoever eateth this Bread shall live Eternally.

When he saith of the Bread of the Eucharist, that it sanctifieth not of it self, it cannot be understood of the true Body of Jesus Christ, but of the Bread which remains. When he saith, This Bread sanctified by the invocation of God, and by Prayer, remains in its material being, it means plainly, That it remains in its former substance. When he saith, That this Bread as to the matter of it goes down into the Belly, and is cast into the draught as the other meats: This not being to be understood of Jesus Christ without Blaspheming, is necessarily to be understood of the Bread. When he calls this Bread the Typical Body, it shews plainly, That this not being the true Body, it is not Transubstantiated. When having spoken of the Typical Body, he after speaks of the Word made Flesh, which cannot but give life to those which eat and receive him; he sufficiently distinguisheth the Bread of the Eucharist from Jesus Christ; the former of which may be mortal, but the latter can never be so to those who receive and eat him.

This passage is so clear and evident, that Sixtus Senensis in his Bibl. l. 6. annot. 66. found no better expedient than to say, That 'twas probable, This passage had been corrupted by the Hereticks. Gennepard and Du Perron suspected Erasmus to have ill translated it: But the learned Origeniana l. Monsieur Huet, nominated to be Bishop of Soissons, saith, It evidently appears by the Original Greek, that this passage is no way changed.

Page. 417.
 Edit. Huet.
 G. L.

The same Origen saith, in Tom. 32. of his Commentary on S. John, that the morsel of Bread Christ gave to Judas and those he gave the Apostles, saying, Take, Eat, were of the same sort. Now if the morsel given to Judas was true Bread, as it is granted, and if the Bread given the other Apostles was not true Bread, then the one and the other were not of the same kind.

The same *Origen* in the Seventh Homily on *Leviticus*, saith, That *Jesus Christ* before his Passion, drank Wine, but being ready to suffer, he refused to drink it; *Ubi vera tempus advenit Crucis sue, accipiens, inquit, Calicem benedixit, & dedit Discipulis suis, dicens, Accipite. & Bibite ex hoc. Vos, inquit, bibite: quia non accessuri estis ad altare, ipse autem tanquam accessurus ad aliare dicit, Amen, dico vobis quia non bibam de generatione vitis hujus, usque quò bibam illud novum vobiscum in Regno Patris mei.* *Origen* affirms, That our Saviour in celebrating the Eucharist, did not drink Wine, because he was ready to approach the Altar (of his Passion) and that the Apostles did drink Wine, because they were not yet ready to approach to the Altar of Martyrdom. And that in this sense, the Figure of the Old Testament was accomplished, where 'twas forbidden to *Aaron* and his Priests to drink Wine when they were about to approach to the Altar. All this Discourse is false, if *Jesus Christ* spake not these words of true Wine, I will not drink, &c. and if what the Apostles drank was not true Wine.

Let us see now what *St. Cyprian* saith, *The Sacrifice of the Lord recommends to us Unity: for when Jesus Christ called his Body, the Bread which is made of several Grains, he recommended the Unity of Christian People; and when he called his Blood, the Wine, made of several Grains and Grapes, he represented one Flock united by the Band of Charity.* Now these words, where *Jesus Christ* called the Bread his Body, and the Wine his Blood, is as if he had said of the Bread, *This is my Body*, and of the Wine, *This is my Blood*. And if hereunto we add the words of the Jesuite *Salmeron*, who said, *If Jesus Christ had said, This Bread is my Body, and this Wine is my Blood, it would have obliged us to have understood these words in a figurative sense, because the Bread cannot be a humane Body, nor the Wine Blood, but in a figurative Sense.* *Bellarmino* saith the same; *If Jesus Christ had said, This Bread is my Body, this proposition must be understood in a figurative Sense; otherwise the Expression would be absurd and impossible.* Now as we see *S. Cyprian* saith, that *Jesus Christ* said of the Body, That 'tis his Body, and of the Wine, That 'twas his Blood, it must be concluded therefore that *Jesus Christ* said of the Bread and Wine, That they were his Body and

Trin. 9.
Tract. 2. &
Tract. 16.

De Esch. l.
I. c. 1.

AGE iii.

and Flood, that is to say, That the Bread and Wine were his Body and Blood in Figure, both the one and the other being represented and signified by the Bread and Wine. And therefore in his Epistle to Cecilius, where at large he proves the Wine must be mingled with Water, he saith, If there be no Wine in the Cup, the Blood of Jesus Christ cannot be represented to us, because 'tis the Wine that represents to us the Blood of Jesus Christ. And again, *Vini ubique mentio est, & ideo ponitur ut I omni Sanguis Vino intelligatur.* He saith of the Water, that, *Sola Christi sanguinem non potest exprimere.* In *aqua vidimus populum intelligi, in Vino ostendi Sanguinem Christi.* So that seeing St. Cyprian saith, That the Wine representeth, expresseth, sheweth, and makes us see the Blood of Jesus Christ, as the Water representeth, expresseth, and shews us the Christian People, it cannot be imagin'd that St. Cyprian believed the Wine was destroy'd, but on the contrary, he believed that after Consecration, the Wine remained, and that 'twas true Wine that he called his Blood, according to what he saith in the same Letter, *Quia in parte invenimus Calicem mixtum fuisse quem Dominus obtulit, & vinum fuisse quod Sanguinem suum dixit.*

AGE iv.

Eusebius.

That the Fathers of the FOURTH CENTURY did not believe Transubstantiation.

Nicen. Syn. 2.
Art. 6.

Eusebius, Patriarch of Antioch, upon these words of Solomon in the Proverbs, *Eat my Bread, and drink the Wine which I have prepar'd;* saith, That the wise Men by the Bread and Wine did foreshew the Antitypes of the Body of Jesus Christ: Now that which is a Type, is an Image; what is an Image cannot be the thing but in Figure: so that the Bread is not destroy'd, because it is the Type and the Image.

Eusebius
Lib. 8. de
Dim. Evang.

Eusebius of Casarea, interpreting these words of Genesis, Chap. 49. Vers. 12. *His Eyes shall be red with Wine, and his Teeth*

Teeth white with Milk, saith, That the first words signifie the Joy that the mystical Wine doth cause in the Disciples of Jesus Christ when he saith to them, Take, Drink ye ALL of this, &c. And these words, The Teeth white with Milk, do signifie the purity and cleanness of the Mystical Food, which are the Symbols which Jesus Christ left to his Disciples, commanding them to celebrate the Image of his proper Body; not requiring any more bloody Sacrifices, and commanded to make use of Bread for the Symbol of his Body.

AGE IV.

Eusebius.

Seeing then that according to this ancient Doctor, the Wine is the Symbol of the Blood of Christ; and the Bread the Figure of his Body, and both the one and the other an Image of the Body and Blood, the Image is not that of which 'tis an Image; and by consequence, in the Eucharist, besides the Body of Jesus Christ, there is also Bread and Wine, which do represent and shew him; it being evident by the Text of this Author, that he understood the words of Jesus Christ, This is my Body, in this sense, This is the Symbol of my Body.

Cyril of Jerusalem saith, *Quemadmodum Panis Eucharisticus post Spiritus Sancti invocationem, non amplius est Panis communis, sed est Corpus Christi, sic & sanctum hoc unguentum non amplius est unguentum illud.*

Cyrillus

Hierosol.

Catech.

Myst. 3.

Maccharius.

Maccharius, a noted Hermite in Egypt, who wrote his Homilies about the year 368. saith in the 27th Homily, That before the birth of Jesus Christ, the wise Men, Holy Men, Kings and Prophets, knew that Jesus Christ was to come to be a redeemer, but they knew not that he was to suffer death, that he was to be Crucify'd, and that he should shed his Blood on the Cross, and that they had not attain'd so far as to know there should be a Baptism of Fire and of the Holy Ghost, and that in the Church should be offered Bread and Wine, Antitypes of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and that those which eat of this visible Bread, should spiritually eat the Flesh of the Lord. This Father saying that the Antitype of the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ is Bread and Wine, doth suppose the Bread remains, as not being the Real Body of Jesus Christ, but a Type of it: now the Type is not the verity, *sed umbra veritatis*, saith Sr. Ambrose, de fide l. 3. c. 8. and by consequence, there is in the Eucharist something else besides the Body it self of Jesus

AGE IV.

Macharius.

Jesus Christ. And when he saith, That those which take the visible Bread, do spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ, he gives us sufficiently to understand, that in this august Sacrament, there is besides the Flesh of Jesus Christ a visible Bread, and that the visible Bread is eaten corporally, and the Flesh of Jesus Christ spiritually.

St. Basil.

Ep. 289.

St. Basil, Bishop of Casaria, in his Epistle to Casarea, saith, That at Alexandria, and in Egypt, each Lay-person for the most part, kept the Eucharist by them, and communicated themselves when they pleased; and if they receive from the Priest a morsel of the consecrated Bread, they may receive the Holy Sacrament daily if they list, taking some of it to day, and the rest to morrow. For, saith he, the Priest in the Church gives a good Piece or Morsel of the Eucharist, and he that takes it, doth communicate himself at his pleasure. Now, saith he, as to the validity and virtue of the Sacrament, it is one and the same, whether one receives one morsel, or two, of the Priest. In what sense can it be understood that one receives several parts or parcels in the Eucharist? It cannot be meant of Jesus Christ, whose Body cannot be divided into morsels; it must therefore be understood, that St. Basil believed that the Bread remained in the Eucharist as a Typical and Symbolical Body of Jesus Christ.

Ephrem.

Ephrem Deacon of the Church of Edessa, contemporary with St. Basil, and whose Writings St. Jerom reports in his Catalogue, were read in the Church after the Holy Scriptures; he saith, in the Treatise he wrote, That Men should not search too curiously into the Nature of God; consider diligently (saith this holy Deacon) how Jesus Christ taking the Bread into his hands, blessed and broke it as a Figure of his immaculate Body; and taking the Cup, he blessed it as a Type of his blessed Blood, and gave it to his Disciples. It is evident that Ephrem believed the Bread is the figure of the Body, and the Wine the Type of the Blood of Christ; *figura autem non est veritas, sed imitatio veritatis*, saith S. Gaudentius upon Exodus, Tract. 2. the Body of Jesus Christ is the verity, there must then be in the Sacrament, besides the real Body, a material and Typical Body, which may be the figure of the true Body of Jesus Christ.

S. Epiphanius having said, That Jesus Christ descended into the Waters to be Baptiz'd, not to receive any virtue from the Waters, but to confer it upon them, he adds, That 'tis in Jesus Christ the Prophecy of *Esay* is accomplished, who in the third Chap. speaks of the virtue of Bread and Water, he gave strength to the Waters, *illuminans eas, & roborans in Typo earum qua in ipso erant perficienda*; and as for the Bread, *Cibus quidem panis est, sed virtus in eo est ad vivificationem*. A. G. E. iv.
Epiphanius.
S. Ep. in Com.
pind. de fide
Eccles. Deus
ad aquas de.
scendit.

S. Epiphanius speaks here of the Eucharist as he doth of Baptism, he saith, That both one and the other receive their virtue from Jesus Christ, who communicates to them spiritual strength, sufficient to sanctify; now as the Water of Baptism is changed only by a change of virtue, and quality, it is apparent S. Epiphanius did not mean that the Bread of the Eucharist should be destroy'd, no more than the Water was in Baptism; else he would not have said, that the Consecrated Bread was a food, for accidents cannot nourish, nothing can be fed by that which is not a Body; nourishment proceeds from a substance or matter, saith Aristotle, and Boëtius. *in Prædic.* saith, that 'tis impossible an accident should pass into the nature of a substance, *ut accidens in substantia naturam transeat fieri nullo modo potest*. Incorporea re
nihil augetur.
Arist. de ge-
nerat. & cor-
ruptione. Ali-
mentum vel
materiam par-
tim. Ibid. l. 22.

Gregory Nazianzen, speaking of the miraculous recovery of his Sister Gorgonia, speaks in these terms, pouring forth a Flood of tears after the example of her that washed Christ's feet with her tears, she said, she would not depart thence till she had recover'd her health; her tears were the perfume which she spread over all his Body, she mingled them with the Antitypes, or the Symbols of the body and Blood of Jesus Christ, as much at least as she could hold in her hands, and immediately, O the Miracle, she found her self healed. And in his seventeenth Oration, this godly Prelate interceding to the Emperor's Prefect, that he would extend his favour, and not deliver up the City to be plundered, I set before your Eyes the Table where we joyntly receive the Sacrament, and the figure of my Salvation, which I consecrate with the same Mouth wherewith I make my request to you; this Sacrament, I say, which lifts us up to Heaven. Greg. Naz.
Orat. 112

AGE IV.

Gregory
Nazianz.

It appears by these words, that S. Gregory lookt upon the Consecrated Bread and Wine as figures of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ: now if they are figures, then they are not that whereof they be figures, and by consequence, there is in the Sacrament something else besides the very Body of Jesus Christ, to wit, the Bread and Wine, which are the Types and figures of it. For to say that S. Gregory means only that the accidents of Bread and Wine are the Types and figures, when he saith, his Sister mingled her tears with the Antitypes of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, as many as she could keep in her hands, *Si quid Antityporum pretiosi Corporis aut Sanguinis manus thesaurisasset*, these words, as many as she could gather in her hands, signify, as many portions and parts of the Eucharist as she could gather up, *pauculum Eucharistiae*, as Eusebius speaks in the sixth Book of his Hist. chap. 36. as having gather'd together a little of the Sacrament, and having separated it from a greater Mass, or from a greater quantity of liquor. Now all antiquity agree, that the lines, the superficies, the qualities, are inseparable from their subject, so that this little parcel of Antitypes, this parcel of the figures, cannot be a part of accidents, and of appearances.

Greg. Nyss.
In his Oration
of the Baptis.
of J. C.

Gregory Nyssen going to prove that the Water of Baptism, for being Water, ought not to be despised, but that after Consecration it hath a marvellous Virtue, he proves it by the Example of the Eucharist, and extream Unction. "The Bread, saith he, before Consecration is but common Bread, but after Consecration it is called, and is the Body of Christ; so also the Mystical Oyl, and Wine, before Benediction, are common things, and of no virtue, but after Benediction, both of them have a great virtue. Now these words shew, that the Bread and Wine remain after Consecration; for it appears that St. Gregory's Design is to prove, that common and ordinary things have a marvellous force after Consecration, and if the Bread and Wine were destroy'd after Consecration, what did operate would not be a vile and mean thing, because it would be the very Body of Jesus Christ, and St. Gregory would not well have proved that vile things have any marvellous virtue in them after Consecration; for instance, Bread and Wine, which not subsisting after Consecration, could not have the virtue to sanctify.

S. Ambrose in his Epistle to *Iustus*, explaining what *Gomeris*, saith, it is a measure, and that this measure signifies the quantity of Wine which rejoyces the heart of Man; and having explain'd the Wine, of the drinking Wisdom, Sobriety, and Temperance, he saith, *That it is to be understood more fully of the Blood of Jesus Christ, which neither admits increase, nor decrease, as to grace; But of which if one receive more or less, the measure however of Redemption is equal to all. Plenus de sanguine intelligitur cujus ad gratiam nihil minuitur, nihil adaugetur, & si parum sumas, & si plurimum haurias, eadem perfecta est omnibus mensura Redemptionis.* This manner of speaking of taking more or less of the Blood of Jesus Christ, is not to be understood of the proper Body of Jesus Christ, which is indivisible; there must be therefore in the Eucharist, besides the proper Blood of Jesus Christ, a Typical and Symbolical Blood, which is the Wine, which is so called, and of which we may say, we receive more or less.

AGE iv.

S. Ambrose.

1. 1. Ep. 1.

The same Father saith elsewhere, *That as often as we receive the Sacraments, which by the virtue of Holy Prayer are transfigur'd into the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ, we shew forth the Death of Christ.* It is certain that by these words, S. Ambrose lookt upon the Bread and Wine as figures of the Flesh and Blood; now the figure being a thing distinct from what it represents, as being two correlatives, the one of which is not the other, it must be concluded, that S. Ambrose believed that there is Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, which are the figures of the Bread and Heavenly Power.

The same Father speaking of the blessing of *Aser*, explaining these Words, *Ashur his Bread is fat, he shall feed Princes;* saith, *Jesus Christ who is Ashur, that is rich, has nourish'd Princes.* When he multiply'd the five and seven Loaves, and gave them to his Apostles to distribute to the multitude, he every day gives us this Bread, saith he, when the Priest doth consecrate: we may also by this Bread understand the Lord himself (continues S. Ambrose) who has given us his Flesh to eat. By these words it appears S. Ambrose distinguishes three sorts of Bread which Jesus Christ gave to these Princes; the first is that which he gave in multiplying the five and seven Loaves, John 6. and *Matth.* 15. the second is the Bread

Idem Tom. 1.
of the blessing
of the Patri-
archs, c. 9.

A G E iv.

Ambrose.

which the Priest consecrates at *Mass*; the third is that of which it is said, *I am the Bread of Life*, which is Jesus Christ himself. As then the second is not the first, so neither is the second the third: The *Consecrated Bread* is another thing than *Jesus Christ, the Bread of Life*; and by consequence, there is in the Sacrament a *Bread* distinct from *Jesus Christ, the Heavenly Bread*.

Gaudentius.

Gaud. Bishop
of Bress.
Tract. 2.

Gaudentius upon Exodus saith, *With great reason we receive with the Bread the figure of the Body of Christ, because as the Bread is compos'd of many grains, which being ground into Flower is kneaded with Water, and baked by Fire, so also the Body of Christ is made and collected of the whole race of Mankind, and is perfected by the Fire of the Holy Ghost.* Now as this Author places the figure of the Body of Jesus Christ in that the Bread is made up of sundry grains, reduced into Meal, kneaded with Water, and baked with fire: it follows, that he believed the Bread remained in the Sacrament, and so much the rather because this Bishop saith elsewhere, *figura non est veritas sed imitatio veritatis.*

Chrysostom.

S. Chry.
Hom. 83. on
S. Matth.

S. Chrysostom expounding these words, "I will no more drink of this fruit of the vine, until I drink it new in the Kingdom of my Father," saith, because Jesus Christ had spoke to his Disciples of his Passion and of his Death, now he speaks to them of his Resurrection, making mention of his Kingdom, calling his resurrection by this name; Now wherefore did Jesus Christ drink after his Resurrection, fearing lest ignorant persons should think his Resurrection was only imaginary, because many took the act of drinking as a true sign of the Resurrection; Therefore the Apostles going to prove his Resurrection, say, we that have eat and drank with him, Jesus Christ. Therefore assuring them that they should see him after his Resurrection, and that he would stay with them, and that they might bear witness of his Resurrection, might see and behold him, tells them, I will no more drink the Fruit of the Vine, until I drink it with you in a new manner, whereof you shall bear testimony, for you shall see me after my Resurrection; But wherefore, continues S. Chrysostom, did he drink Wine after his Resurrection and not Water? it is because he would thereby destroy a pernicious Heresy. For because there would be Hereticks that would only make use of water in the Mysteries, he would represent the Mysteries; he gave Wine, "and

“and when, after the Resurrection, he eat his common Repast,
 “he drank Wine, the Fruit of the Vine; now the Vine doth produce
 “Wine and not Water. This Passage marketh in the first place,
 That Jesus Christ drinking the *Fruit of the Vine* after his Re-
 surrection, and not Water, he accomplish’d what he said in
 celebrating the Eucharist, *I will no more drink of this Fruit of*
the Vine, until I drink it new in my Fathers Kingdom. This
 shews that Jesus Christ drank true Wine in the Institution
 of the Eucharist, for what is to be done again, must needs
 be done before. Secondly, St. Chrysostom doth not only say
 that Jesus Christ drank Wine, but he saith further, That he
 distributed Wine amongst his Disciples, and the *Fruit of the*
Vine, which doth not produce Water but Wine. So that these
 words of St. Chrysostom import clearly, That the Wine re-
 mains in the Eucharist.

AGE iv.
 Chrysostom.

The same Father on these words of the First to the Corin- *Idem in*
 thians, *The Bread which we break is it not the Communion of the* *Hom. 24.*
Body of Christ? (speaks thus) *What is the Bread? it is the*
Body of Jesus Christ. What becomes of them which receive it?
they become the Body of Jesus Christ. Now this Proposition,
The Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, cannot be in a Li-
 teral Sense, for saith Vasquez, *The Bread without a Figure,*
cannot be called the Body of Jesus Christ, nor the Body of Jesus
Christ be called Bread.

The same Father in his Commentary upon the Epistle to
 the Galatians, Chap. 5. explaining these words of the Apostle,
The Flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the
Flesh; The Manicheans understood by the *Flesh*, the sub-
 stance of the Body, and by the *Spirit* they understood the
 Soul; and they said, That the Apostle cut Man into two,
 and intimated, that Man was compos’d of two contrary
 Substances, one bad, which was the *Flesh*; and the other
 good, which was the *Spirit*, which proceeded from the
 good God, and the Body from the bad God.—S. Chry-
 sostom answers, That the Apostle in this place doth not
 call the *Flesh* the Body, *Apostolum non hic carnem appel-*
lare Corpus, as the Manicheans supposed, and saith, That
 the Apostle do’s not always mean by the *Flesh*, the nature
 of the Body, *Naturam Corporis*, but that very often by the
Flesh,

AGE iv.

Chrysostom.

Flesh, he means something else, as *evil Desires*; and having proved this by sundry passages of the Apostle, and other holy Writers, he proves it at last by the example of the *Eucharist*, and of the Church, which, he saith, is called *Body* in the Holy Scriptures; he saith farther, That the Scripture is wont to call by the name of *Flesh*, as well the Church, as the *Mysteries*, saying, It is his *Body*, *Rursum Carnis vocabulo Scriptura solet appellare tum Mysteria, tum totam Ecclesiam, dicens eam Christi Corpus esse.* It appears by these words of St. Chrysostom's, That he did not believe that the Consecrated Bread and Wine were the same with the *Body of Christ*, seeing he proves by the *Eucharist*, that the Consecrated Bread and Wine are called *Flesh*; and that the Word *Flesh* in this place, is taken for something else besides *Body*, and that he puts the Term *Flesh*, given to the Consecrated Bread and Wine, which are the *Mysteries*, in the rank of other Terms of *Flesh* given to *evil Desires*, and to the Church, which are *mystical* and *figurative* Terms. So St. Chrysostom believed the Bread and Wine remained, and are so called the *Body* of Jesus Christ mystically, as the Church is called the *Body* of Jesus Christ.

The same St. Chrysostom wrote a Letter to *Cæsarius*, which indeed is not inserted in his Works, but is found in Manuscript in the Library at Florence, and it was also found in England in Archbishop Cranmer's Library, it is mention'd in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Printed at Collen, 1618. in this *Bibliothèque*, Tom. 4. there is found the Collections of an ancient nameless Author, who wrote against the *Severian*, and *Acephalian* Hereticks, wherein is recited a Passage taken out of this Letter. So also Monsieur de Marca Arch-Bishop of Paris, acknowledges the truth of this Letter in his *Posthume* and *French* Treatise of the *Eucharist*, witness the Abbot Fagget in his Letter to Monsieur de Marca, President of the Parliament at Pau, who saith also this Letter was found by Monsieur Bigot in a Library at Florence. St. Chrysostom in this Letter writeth against *Apolinarius*, and saith, "*Jesus Christ is both God and Man, God because of his Impassibility, Man by his Passion, one Son,*"

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

439

“one Lord, both Natures united making but one, the same Power;
“the same Dominion; although they be two different Natures,
“each conserves its own Nature, because they are two, and yet
“without confusion; for as the Bread before it is sanctified, is
“called Bread, when by the intercession of the Priest, Divine
“Grace has sanctified it, it loses the name of Bread, and be-
“comes worthy to be called the Body of Jesus Christ, al-
“though the Nature of Bread abides in it, so that they are
“not two Bodies, but one sole Body of the Son; so the Di-
“vine Nature being united to the Humane Nature of Jesus
“Christ, it did not make two Persons, but one only Person and
“one Son.

AGE IV.

Chrysostom.

St. Chrysostom saith plainly, That the Nature of Bread a-
bideth after Consecration; and this Father's Argument would
be of no validity, if this nature of the Bread was no-
thing but in shew, for Apollinarius might have made ano-
ther opposite Argument, and say, That indeed it might
be said there were two Natures in Jesus Christ, but that
the Humane Nature was only in appearance, as the Bread
in the Eucharist is but in shew, and hath only outward
and visible qualities remaining in it, whereby it is term'd
to be Bread.

The Author of the imperfect Work upon St. Matthew This Author
written in the time of the Emperour Theodosius, did not goes under
believe Transubstantiation, when he spake in these Terms in
Homily Eleventh, If it be dangerous to employ the holy Vess-
els about common uses, wherein the true Body of Jesus Christ
is not contain'd, but the Mysteries of his Body; how much
rather the Vessels of our Bodies, which God has prepared to
dwell in.

St. Chrysostom's
Name.

That

AGE v.

That the Fathers of the FIFTH CENTURY
did not believe Transubstantiation.

S. Jerom.

S. Jerom in his Epistle to Eustochium speaking of Virgins, saith, That when they were reproved for Drunkennels, they excus'd themselves by adding Sacriledge to Drunkennels, saying, *God forbid that I should abstain from the Blood of the Lord.*

It appears by these words, that they imply the common belief, that there was true Wine in the Eucharist; because they say, That should they abstain from Wine, they must abstain also from the Blood of the Lord.

* Di. fidi l. 2. c. 5.

In the Second Book against Jovinian, it is said, *The Lord in the Type of his Blood, did not offer Water, but Wine.* These words are indeed Jovinian's, but St. Jerom finds no fault with them. For he himself saith the same, upon the 31 Chapter of Jeremy, Vers. 12. on these Words, *They run after God's Creatures, the Wheat, the Wine, and the Oyl, the Bread, and the Wine, saith he, whereof is made the Bread of the Lord, and wherein is accomplished the Type of his Blood.* Now saith St. Ambrose *, *The Type is not the Truth, but it is the shadow of the Truth.* There must then be in the Eucharist, Bread, and Wine, distinct from the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, to be the Types and Figures of it.

The same Father in his Letter to Hedibia, *Let us hear, that the Bread which the Lord brake and gave his Disciples was the Lord's own Body, saying, Take, Eat, This is my Body; and a little after he saith, If the Bread that came down from Heaven is the Body of the Lord, and the Wine which he distributed among his Disciples his Blood, &c.*

St. Jerom saith, That Jesus Christ brake and distributed Bread to his Disciples, that he gave them Bread, and that the Bread and Wine were his Flesh and Blood. It cannot then be said, That what Jesus Christ gave in communicating his Disciples was not Bread and Wine; and when he saith, both the one and the other was his Body and Blood, it cannot be understood but only figuratively; for we see above in St. Cy-
prian,

prian, that the Jesuites Salmeron and Bellarmine, do confess, That if Jesus Christ said of the Bread, *This is my Body*, it must be meant, *This Bread is the Figure of my Body*, the one not being capable of being the other but figuratively: And the Reason is given by Vasquez, when he saith, *If the Pronoun, This, in the words of Consecration be understood of the Bread, undoubtedly by virtue of it, there can be wrought no Transubstantiation, because of necessity the Bread must needs remain; Si Pronomen hoc in illis verbis demonstraret panem, fatemur fore ut nulla conversio virtute illorum fieri posset, quia panis de quo enunciatur manere debeat.*

The same S. Jerom in his Commentary upon the 26 Chapter of St. Matthew, saith, Jesus Christ having eaten the Paschal Lamb, took Bread which strengthens the Heart of Man, and proceeded to the accomplishment of the Sacrament of the true Passover, that as Melchisedeck had offered Bread and Wine in Figure, he also himself would represent the truth of his Body.

According to this Father, the Bread and Wine, represent the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and therefore are not properly and truly the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ, but are something else besides them, and by consequence remain in the Sacrament. For to say, as the Author of the Second Book of the perpetuity of the Faith of the Eucharist doth against Monsieur Claude, that St. Jerom means by representing, to make a thing be present, we before refuted this Fancy, in Tertullian, who speaks just as St. Jerom: And the terms sufficiently declare, that St. Jerom's meaning is, That Jesus Christ made use of Bread and Wine, to signify and shew forth his Body and Blood, as Melchisedeck had done, that is to say, as he had represented both the one and the other by the Oblation of Bread and Wine.

St. Austin in his Sermon to the newly Baptized, which it's true is not found in his other Works, but was preserv'd and is cited by "St. Fulgentius de Baptismo Ebiop. Cap. 7. "What you see, saith he, upon the Altar of God, you saw also the last Night, but you were not yet aware of how great a thing it is a Sacrament; That which you see is Bread, and a Cup of Wine, and it is also what your Eyes declare unto you; but what your Faith should instruct you in, is, That the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, and the Cup his Blood. If you tell me, Jesus Christ is born, he was crucified, he was buried, he rose again, and is ascended into Heaven, whither he has carry'd his Body, and is

AGE v.

St. Austin.

"at present on the right hand of God, from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead, how then can the Bread be his Body, and the Cup his Blood? these things, my Brethren, are called Sacraments, because one thing is seen in them, and another thing is understood by them? what is seen hath a Corporeal Substance; what is understood hath a Spiritual Fruit. If then you desire to understand what the Body of Jesus Christ is, hearken to the Apostle which saith, You are the Body of Christ and his Members: If then you are the Body of Jesus Christ and his Members, it is the Mystery of what you are, which is upon the Holy Table, it is the Mystery of the Lord, which you receive; in saying Amen, you answer and subscribe to what you are. All you that are united in Charity, you make but one Body of Jesus Christ, of which you are the Members, which is what is signified by the Bread compos'd of several Grains, and by the Wine which is made of sundry Grapes. For as Bread to be made a visible Species of Bread, is made of sundry Grains collected together in one, and the Wine, &c.

St. Austin

St. Austin saith, That the Bread is the Body of Christ, which cannot be but improperly and figuratively, as hath been shewed above; for by Confession of Roman Catholick Doctors, every Proposition that saith of the Bread, That it is the Body, must needs be typical and figurative.

He saith what is seen is Bread, as our Eyes declare to us; now what our Eyes report to us is true Bread, as when one says, What you see is true Gold, and Silver, or Marble, and 'tis what your Eyes testify, that is to say, That one sees true Gold, and true Marble, and that one makes use of their Eyes to confirm it.

In the same sense he saith; That Jesus Christ although in Heaven, yet the Bread is the Body, and the Wine the Blood, because they are the Sacraments of it.

He saith, What one sees hath a bodily species; now in this Passage, by bodily species, he means the very Substance, and not the Accidents. For he saith afterwards, speaking of Bread in general, as Bread to be a visible species of Bread, must be made of several Grains reduced into one lump; now by the species of Bread, it is plain, St. Austin there means true Bread, and a true Substance.

He saith, What you see, is Bread, and a Cup; now by Cup, he doth not mean the appearance of a Cup, he means a true Cup. He saith this Bread is the Mystery of the Lord. Which is nothing else, but that 'tis the Figure of the Lord, as when he saith, This Bread

Bread is the *Mystery of Believers*. *Mysterium vestrum in Mensa Domini accipitis.* That is to say, That the Bread and Wine are the *Figure* of Jesus Christ; as they are the *Mystical Body* of Jesus Christ. To conclude, St. *Austin* saith, The Faith of the New-baptized was to be strengthened; it was therefore here the proper place for him to have said, That the Bread was no more Bread, that the Wine was no longer Wine, but that there remained only the *Accidents* of the one and the other.

The same Holy Father answering Bishop *Boniface*, who desired to know how it might be said of an Infant newly Baptis'd, he hath Faith, he *Believes*, who is incapable of believing, and of whom no assurance can be given what he will be afterwards; he saith, "That as every Sunday, and Easter Day, is called Easter, and the Resurrection, although the Lords Easter, and Resurrection, are things happened several Ages past; so it may be said, An Infant hath Faith, because he hath the Sacrament of Faith. For, saith he, if the Sacraments had not some resemblance with the things whereof they are Sacraments, they would be no Sacraments; as therefore in some sort the Sacrament of the Body of Jesus Christ is the Body of Jesus Christ, and the Sacrament of his Blood, is the Blood of Christ, so also the Sacrament of Faith, is Faith; now to believe, is nothing else but to have Faith."

He saith, The Eucharist is called *Flesh and Blood*, because it is both the one and the other in some sort: now according to St. *Gregory Nyssen*, What is not truly that by the name by which it is called, is but figuratively or improperly that by the name whereof it is called. Now that the Bread and Wine which are the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, are his Body and Blood in some sort, secundum quendam modum, it follows, The Bread and Wine are not properly the *Flesh and Blood*, and by consequence, are not *Transubstantiated*. Moreover St. *Austin* doth explain the Manner according to which the Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ, and he shews it, by reason that generally the signs are called by the name of the things they signify, not that they are the things they signify, but because they are the signs, and that they have some resemblance to them.

The same Father upon the third Psalm, admires the Patience of Jesus Christ that bore the Treachery of Judas to the end, although he was not ignorant of his Thoughts, and admitted him to the Banquet, at which, saith St. *Austin*, Jesus Christ

AGE V.
St. Austin.

Ep. 23. ad Bonif.

Quod non per omnia est id quod esse dicitur, illud abusive appellati- onem illam habet.

AGE v.

St. Austin.

* De Princip.
Dialect. l. 5.
Signum est
quod scriptum
sensibus, &
præter se ali-
quid animo
ostendit.

recommended and gave to his Disciples, the *Figure* or *Type* of his *Flesh* and *Blood*, *Cum adhibuit ad convivium, in quo Corporis & Sanguinis sui Figuram Discipulis commendavit & tradidit. Nam* the *Figure* is not the *Truth*, but the *Imitation* of the *Verity*, saith *Gaudentius* in *Exod. Tractatu 2.* Moreover, *St. Austin* cannot find in the *Scriptures*, that *Jesus Christ* in instituting the *Sacrament*, gave to his *Disciples* the *Figure* of his *Body* and *Blood*, but in these words, *Take, Eat, This is my Body, This is my Blood*, he must then understand these words of the *Institution*, in a *figurative* sense. And according to the same *Doctor*, a * *Sign* is that which shows it self to the *Senses*, and besides that shows something else to the *Mind*; It must then follow, That the *Sign* is a thing which remains, to shew it self.

The same *Father* disputing against *Adimantus* the *Manichean*, *Chap. 12.* and against the *Adversary* of the *Law* and the *Prophets*, in the *Second Book*, *Cap. 6.* who said, The *Blood* is the *Soul*, as is said, *Deuteronom. 12.* and by consequence, that *Men* killed the *Soul* when they shed *Blood*. *S. Austin* replies, That this *Precept* in *Deuteronomy*, That *Blood* must not be eat, because 'tis the *Soul*, is a *Precept* that must be understood as many other things contained in the *Scriptures*, which are to be taken in *Types*, and *Figures*, *Illud præceptum posicum esse dicimus sicut alia multa & pene omnia Scripturarum illarum Sacramenta signis & figuris plena sunt.* And concludes towards the end of that *Chapter*, That the *Blood* is the *Soul*, as the *Rock* was *Christ*, *Sanguis est Anima quomodo petra erat Christus.* And upon *Leviticus*, *Quest. 34.* The thing which signifies, is wont to be called by the name of the thing signified, as 'tis written, the *Rock* was *Christ*: For 'tis not said, The *Rock* signifi'd *Christ*, but as if it were that which indeed it was not in *Substance*, but only in *signification*. And as in the beginning of the *Chapter* he saith, That it must be understood in the *Sign*, *Jesus Christ* making no difficulty to say, *This is my Body*, when he gave the *Sign* of his *Body*. *Sanguis est Anima, præceptum illud est in signo posicum, non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere, Hoc est Corpus meum, cum daret signum Corporis sui.* Seeing then *St. Austin* doth say, That the *Blood* is the *Soul*, as the *Rock* was *Christ*; and as the *Eucharist* is the *Sign* of *Jesus Christ*, he must of necessity have understood the *Words* of *Institution* of the *Sacrament*, in a *figurative*

tive sense; and that so much the rather, because this manner of speech, *Jesus Christ made no difficulty*, plainly shews, that *Jesus Christ did not speak in a proper but in a figurative sense*, as *Fulgensius* saith, *Although the Apostle saith, That Jesus Christ is the Head of the Body of the Church, nevertheless he makes no Scruple to call Jesus Christ the Church, which is his Body.*

AGE v.

St. Austin.

Ad Monym. l.

2. c. 10.

cum Electionis

Vas dicat quia

Christus caput

est corporis Ec-

clesiæ, ipsam

tamen corpus

Christi non du-

bitat Christus

veraciter ap-

pellare.

Ad Paulin.

Ep. 59.

This manner of speech is never used in proper expressions: no Body will say, *Jesus Christ made no difficulty to give Gold, or Water, if it were true Gold or Water which he gave.*

The same holy Doctor saith in several places after the Apostle, That the *Bread* in the Sacrament after Consecration, is broken, and distributed; and he doth very well recommend this breaking the Bread, as being a great mystery. In his Epistle to *Paulinus*, he saith, *In that Jesus Christ was known by the two Disciples in breaking the Bread, no body ought to question but this breaking was the Sacrament whereby Jesus Christ brings us all to the knowledge of his Person.* A little before he saith; *By the Prayers, we mean those which are said before one begins to bless what is upon the Lords Table.* The Prayers are said when that which is on the Lords Table is blessed, sanctified, and distributed. In his Epistle to *Casulanus* he saith of *St. Paul*, that in the night time he went to break Bread, as it is broken in the Sacrament of his Body. In his Commentary upon the first Epistle of *S. John*, It was very reasonable that *Jesus Christ* recommending his Flesh, broke Bread, and it was very just that the Disciples knew him in breaking of Bread.

Ep. 86.

Tract. 2.

In the 140. Sermon de temp. and in the Hom. Of the content of Evangelists, lib. 3. c. 25. and de diversis, Sermon. 87. he saith, *Where would Jesus Christ be known? In the breaking of Bread. We are then secure; we break Bread, and we know the Lord.* If then after consecration we break Bread to distribute, then of necessity the Bread must remain: for to say that 'tis the accidents which are broken, and distributed, *S. Austin* doth say the contrary, when he affirms, that one breaks and distributes what is on the Table, being blessed and sanctified. Now to bless and sanctify, one shall never find to have signified to destroy, and change the substance.

The same Doctor in several places does always call the Eucharist, the Sacrament of Bread and Wine, he saith, *S. Paul* doth teach the unity of the Church in the Sacrament of Bread, when he saith, *We are all one Bread, and one Body.* In the questions

De consensu

Evangelist. l.

3. c. 25.

AGE v.
St. Austin.

l. 1. q. 43.

l. 20. c. 13.

questions upon the Evangelists, he saith, *Jesus Christ by the Sacrament of Wine, recommends his Blood.* In his Books against *Faustus*, we are very far from doing what the Heathens did for their Gods, *Ceres and Bacchus*, although we have a ceremony of celebrating the Sacrament of Bread and Wine. Now to what end were it to call the Eucharist a Sacrament of Bread and Wine, if there did not remain Bread and Wine after Consecration? for what means this manner of speech, the Sacrament of Bread and Wine, but the Bread and Wine which is the Sacrament? As when the Apostle saith, *Rom. 4. v. 11. the sign of Circumcision.* What else doth this import, but the Circumcision which is the sign? When *Tertullian de Baptismo*, calls Baptism *Sacramentum aqua nostra*: What else can that mean, but our Water which is a Sacrament? When *S. Austin* upon *S. John* Tract. 11. saith, *The figure of the Sea, figura Maris*; What more can this signify, but the Sea which is the figure? When it is frequently said, the Sacrament of the Eucharist, what else can that import, but the Eucharist which is a Sacrament?

*Penè quidem
Sacramentum
omnes corpus
eius dicunt.*

The same Father in his 52 Sermon, *de verbis Domini*, saith, almost all do call the Sacrament the Body of *Jesus Christ*. Now if the Bread were the real Body of *Jesus Christ*, wherefore should *S. Austin* observe that all called it the Body of *Jesus Christ*? For one cannot make such a remark, but when one saith of a thing, that 'tis that which properly it is not. It would be ridiculous to say, almost all call *Lewis* 14 King; & the reason is, because 'tis not strange that persons should be called by their names: but on the contrary, it is very strange, to call one by a name that doth not at all belong to him.

The same Father in his 26. Treatise upon *S. John*, going to shew upon these words of the Apostle, *They did all eat the same Spiritual meat, and drink the same Spiritual drink*: The relation and difference there is betwixt the Sacraments of the old and new Testament, saith, *The Fathers did eat the same Spiritual food as we do, not the same corporal food as we do; because they did eat Manna, and as for us, we eat something else; They drank the same spiritual drink we do, the same as to the signification, but different as to visible and outward kind.* And upon *S. John*, Treatise 45. *If you consider the visible species, it was another drink, if you consider what was signify'd by their drink, and ours, it was one and the same thing. Si speciem visibilem intendas aliud est, si intelligibilem significationem, eundem potum spiritualem biberunt.*

And

And upon the 77. Psalm, *Their food was the very same with ours, the same as to what is signify'd, but different in kind. Idem in mysterio cibis illorum qui noster; Sed significatio idem, non specie.* This reasoning does intimate, That the Fathers under the old Testament did, and we now do eat a corporal food, and that we drink a corporal liquor. Now by this corporal meat and drink, we must understand either the *accidents* of Bread and Wine, or the *Body* and *Blood* of Jesus Christ, or the *Bread* and *Wine* it self. It cannot be spoken of the first, because the *accidents* of Bread and Wine are only *qualities*, or *dimensions*; now *qualities* and *dimensions* are not corporal: The *quality* is something which is *incorporeal*, saith *Nemesius*, of the Soul; as concerning *dimensions*, *S. Austin de genesi ad literam*, saith, *We call that a Body which taketh up some space by its length, by its breadth, and by its depth.* *Nemesius* gives the reason of it, because, saith he, *nothing that is immaterial is a Body, for all Bodies are material.* There being nothing material then in the Eucharist, as is suppos'd, there being nothing that takes up place, that is large or long, or deep; There is nothing corporeal in the Sacrament, and by consequence, nothing that can be termed corporal meat or drink. Moreover, when Jesus Christ speaks of corporal nourishment and drink in the Eucharist, as the Fathers under the old Testament had done, he speaks of bodily meat and drink, *S. Austin* did not understand the corporal meat and drink spoke of by the Fathers of the old Testament, to be only the *accidents* of one and the other, so that *S. Austin* speaking in the same terms of bodily meat and drink, in relation to that of the Antients, he did not mean meer accidents or qualities: The *Body* of Jesus Christ nor his *Blood*, cannot be this corporal nourishment which *S. Austin* compares to that of the Fathers under the Law: for by bodily meat and drink which he saith we receive in the Eucharist, he means a visible subject, *aliud illi, aliud nos, sed specie visibili, si speciem visibilem intendat, aliud est.* It remains then that in *S. Austin's* sense, we understand by the corporal nature of the Eucharist the *visible Bread*, the *visible Wine*, and not their *qualities* and *accidents*.

The same Father in the third Book of the Trin. cap. 10. speaking of things that are taken to signify, saith, *a thing is taken to signify, either after such a manner, as that the thing should subsist and remain some time, as did the Brazen Serpent, lift up in*
the

AGE v.

St. Austin.

the Wilderness, or as do the letters of the Alphabet, or in such a manner as the thing taken to signify is not to subsist any long time, but is to pass away and be destroyed when the thing 'tis to represent is passed away; as the Bread of the Sacrament, which being taken to signify passeth away and is consumed in receiving the Sacrament. S. Austin there saith, That the Bread of the Sacrament which is taken to signify, passeth and is consumed in receiving the Sacrament; Now if the Bread be destroyed and Transubstantiated by these words, *This is my Body*, then it passeth not away, and is not consumed in the act of receiving.

The same Doctor in the seventeenth Of the City of God saith, *To eat Bread, is in the New Testament the sacrifice of Christians*; and against the Enemy of the Law. l. 7. c. 20. *Those*, saith he, *which read know what Melchisedeck offered where he blessed Abraham, and those which are partakers, see that the like sacrifice is now offer'd through all the World*. How is it that the Sacrifice of Christians, is to eat Bread, if the Bread do not remain? How is it that communicating, one is partaker of what Melchisedeck offer'd, if in communicating, one do not receive neither Bread, nor Wine?

The same Father in the third Book against Parmenian, reproving the Donatists for forsaking the Church, tells them, S. Cyprian, and the other Bishops, did not separate themselves because they would not communicate with covetous persons, and Usurers; but that on the contrary, they did eat with them the Bread of the Lord, and drank his Cup. This passage sheweth, that when S. Austin said to the new Baptised, as hath been shewn, that the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, it could not be understood but figuratively: for here the Bread is said to be of the Lord; now saith S. Asbanasius, that which is another's is not that other himself, to whom it belongs. *Id quod alienius est, non id ipsum est cuius est*. And S. Austin elsewhere distinguisheth betwixt the Bread which belongs to the Lord, and the Bread which is the Lord. Speaking of Judas and the other Apostles, he saith of the Apostles, they ate the Bread which was the Lord; and of Judas, He did eat the Bread of the Lord against the Lord; they ate life, he Death; for 'tis said by S. Paul, That he which eateth unworthily, eateth his own judgement and condemnation. Seeing then that the Eucharist is distinguish'd from the Lord, it necessarily follows, That Bread remains in the Sacrament after Consecration.

The

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

435

The same Father in his 33 Sermon of the Words of our Lord, saith, *'The Lord gave to his Disciples the Blessed Sacrament with his own hands, but we were not at the Banquet; nevertheless by Faith we daily eat the same Supper; and do not think that it had been any great advantage to have been present at that Supper that he gave with his own hands to his Disciples, without Faith; Faith afterwards was of greater advantage than treachery was then; St. Paul who believed, was not there present, and Judas who betray'd his Master, was present. How many be there now that come to the Communion, that altho they did not see that Table, and tho they never saw with their Eyes, nor tasted with their Palate, the Bread which the Lord held in his hands, nevertheless, because the same Supper is still prepared, do there eat and drink their own Damnation? It plainly appears, That the Bread which St. Austin saith our Saviour had in his hands during the Sacrament, was true Bread, because St. Austin saith, That those who at present participate of the Sacrament, do not Taste, nor Eat the Bread which our Saviour held in his hands, and which he distributed, and of which the Disciples did formerly eat.*

A G E V.

St. Augustin.

The same Father teaching that the Good might participate of the Divine Sacraments with the Wicked, saith, *Judas and Peter had each of them a part of the same Bread, which they received at the same hand of the Lord; and nevertheless what society or likeness was there betwixt Peter and Judas? In the 7th Chap. the wicked and the good hear the same Word of God, do partake of the same Sacraments, and eat the same holy nourishment. Now what is this holy Food? What is this Bread, whereof one receives one Portion, and another, another Part? Are they Accidents? But Accidents are neither Bread nor Food. It is not the real Body of Jesus Christ, for it cannot be received by Parcels; it must then be true Bread which remains after Consecration, and which is, as is said before, Blessed, Sanctified, and Broke in Pieces on the Holy Table to be distributed. Benedicatur & Sanctificatur, & ad distribuendum comminuitur.*

Lib. Con. Donat. c. 6. de ipso quippe Pane, de ipsa Dominica Manu, &c.

Ep. 59.

The same Doctor in Ep. 120. speaking of the Rich in opposition to the Poor, of whom it is said, *That they shall eat and be satisfied. These Rich Persons, saith St. Austin, have been brought to the Lord's Table, and receive from his hand his Body and Blood, but they only adore, and are not satisfied. For just as St. Ambrose distinguisheth betwixt drinking the Wine, Vinum bibere; and drinking of the Wine, de Vino bibere; that is to say, to taste of a little Wine, de ejus portione libare: so also St. Austin his Disciple, distinguisheth betwixt*

Et ipsi quidem adducti sunt ad Mensam Christi, &c.

De Noe & Arca, c. 29.

AGE V.

S. Augustine.

betwixt receiving the Body and Blood of the Lord, *accipere Corpus & Sanguinem Domini*, and to receive of the Body and Blood of the Lord, *Accipere de Corpore & Sanguine Christi*. St. Austin explains himself more fully, when he saith in his 86th Epist. That one receives in the Eucharist a Portion of the Body of the immaculate Lamb, *De Agni immaculati Corpore partem sumere*: And in the 35th Sermon on the Words of our Lord, he saith, *In receiving the Sacrament, we know what we should think of, we receive a little, and we are satiated in the heart, modulum accipimus & in corde saginamur*. Now that cannot be understood of the proper Body of Jesus Christ, which cannot be received by Parcels; therefore it must be meant of Bread, which is the Figure of his Body, or the Sacrament of it. It is what St. Austin intends, when he saith, *Nec quando manducamus* (when we eat Jesus Christ) *de illo partes facimus; eundem in Sacramento sic fit*. We do not make Morfels, but it is done in Sacrament, that is to say, That we break and divide the Sign and the Bread, which is the Sacrament.

The same Father saying that the *Accidents* cannot in any wise subsist without their Subject, saith in his 2^d Book of Soliloquies, Chap. 12. *What can reconcile what you demand? Or who can think it possible to be done, that that which is in a Subject should remain, the Subject it self ceasing to be? For 'tis a thing monstrous, and very far from the Truth, that that which doth not subsist, if it be not in a Subject, can be, the Subject it self not remaining*. Also in the 13th Chap. 19th Book, and in the Book of the Immortality of the Soul, Chap. 5. *The Subject being changed, of necessity all that was in the Subject must be changed*. In the 8th Chap. *What is not of it self, if it be abandoned by that by which it is, must undoubtedly cease to be*. Also in the 10th Chap. and in the Book of Categories, speaking of Accidents, *A colour cannot be without a Subject*. And in the Epistle to Dardanus, *Take away the Bodies from the qualities of Bodies, they will have no place to remain in, and by consequence it is necessary that they cannot be*. And against Julian, Chap. 5. *It's true, saith St. Austin, that the things that are in a Subject as the qualities are, cannot be without the Subject wherein they are, as the colour or form, &c.* It's impossible, had St. Austin believed that the Bread did not remain in the Eucharist after Consecration, that he should have esteemed that absurd and ridiculous which happened every day. It also seems that St. Austin had been too wide, when he doubts in the 146th Ep. to Consentius; Whether Jesus Christ has Blood, when he saith on the 98th Psalm, *You shall*

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

437

AGE VI

S. Augustine.

not eat this Body which you see, nor shall drink this Blood, which those that shall crucify me shall shed, I have given you a Sacrament, &c. And in the 20th Book against Faustus, The Flesh and Blood of this Sacrifice was promised by Sacrifices of resemblance before the coming of Jesus Christ; It was given by the verity in the Passion of Jesus Christ; after the Ascension of Jesus Christ, it is celebrated by the Sacrament of Commemoration.

To conclude, St. Austin in his 33d Sermon on the Words of our Lord, having said, as hath been seen before, That of things which are put to signify, there are some that are to remain, others to be destroy'd, when the Ministry of their Signification is accomplish'd; as the Bread of the Sacrament; he adds, *But because these things are obvious to men, as being practis'd by Men; they may deserve our Veneration, as being Holy and Religious things; but they cannot cause any wonder in us, as if they were miraculous.* Certainly if St. Austin had held Transubstantiation, as it comprehends many things repugnant to natural Reason, which are so many astonishing Miracles, St. Austin could not have said, That the Sacraments, wherein he includes that of the Eucharist, have something in them that deserves our Respect and Veneration; but have nothing that deserves our Astonishment and Admiration.

These are some of the Reasons which made Monsieur De Marca, Archbishop of Paris, Predecessor to him that with so much French Post-hum. Treatise Reputation now fills the chiefest See of France, say, That the Catholic Doctors are to blame, when they pretend that St. Austin expounded the Text of the Institution of the Eucharist, as it is done in the Schools. And a little before; that in St. Austin's Divinity, *This is my Body*, should be expounded in this manner, *This Bread is the Sign and Sacrament of my Body*: For according to St. Austin, saith Monsieur De Marca, The Bread, to speak properly, is but the Sign and Sacrament of the Body, to which Jesus Christ made no scruple to give the name of the thing signified. It is also the Judgment of Tertullian, when he saith, *When Jesus Christ said, this is my Body, That is to say, this is the Figure of my Body*; and saith Monsieur De Marca, The Reasons that are given to the contrary, are not satisfactory.

Bullenger writing against Casaubon, recites this passage of Theodoret, who was a Priest at Antioch, in the year 411. *As the King, saith he, and his Image are not two Kings; so also the personal Body of Jesus Christ, which Body is in the Heavens, and the Bread which is*

AGE v.

Theodoret.

his Antitype, and is distributed to Believers by the Priest, are not two Bodies. It appears by this comparison, That Theodoret did believe the Bread of the Eucharist is something else besides the Body of Christ; and by consequence, he believed that there remained true Bread in the Sacrament, and not Bread in shew and appearance only.

Dial. 1.

Theodoret, who in the year 423 was Bishop of Cyrus, doth so fully explain himself hereupon, that there is no doubt to be made of his Opinion, He was pleas'd, saith he, that those who participated of the Divine Mysteries, should not have any regard to the nature of the things that are seen; but that they should believe by the change of Names, the change that is made by Grace: For having called his Body, Wheat and Bread, and having called himself a Vine, he honours the visible Symbols with the name of his Body and Blood, not in changing their Nature, but in adding Grace to their Nature. He could not more fully express that he did not hold Transubstantiation.

Arnobius junior.

Accipimus frumentum, &c. Quod nunc habet intra se Ecclesia videmus, &c.

Arnobius the younger, who wrote in the year 431. upon the 4th Psalm saith, speaking of the Sacrament, We have received Wheat in the Body, Wine in the Blood, and Oyl in the Chrism. On the 22d Psalm, and on the 51st and 54th Psalms: Let us see what the Church keepeth; She hath a Table, from which she gives Bread to Believers; She hath Oyl, wherewith she refresheth the Head, in libertatem conscientiae præsumentis, &c.

Accipimus panem quod confirmat, &c.

Exurgens a Mortuis, &c.

On Psalm 103. We receive Bread because it strengthens the Body; we receive Wine, because it rejoices the Heart; and having received double comfort in the Heart, our Faces are made shine by the Oyl of Chrism. To conclude, on Psalm 104. he saith these words, speaking of the Lord, That the Lord in the Eucharist gives us the Species of Bread and Wine, as he doth the Species of Oyl in Baptism; which cannot be understood of appearances and Accidents, as the terms of Species of Oyl cannot be taken for the Accidents and appearances of Oyl. Moreover, he observes we receive in the Eucharist Bread and Wine, as we receive Oyl in the Holy Chrism; Now in the Holy Chrism, it is true Oyl that we receive; Arnobius then could not reason so, if he believed Transubstantiation.

Prosper.

nam et hic

The Author of the Books of the Promises and Predictions of God, attributed to St. Prosper by Cassiodorus, and which were written about the year 450, under the Empire of Valentinian the 3d, relates a History of a young unchast Girl that was possessed with the Devil, who in Communicating, had received a little morsel of the Lord's

Lord's Body, which the Priest had moistned; it was half an hour before she could swallow it down, till such time as the Priest touched her throat with the Chalice; then she cried out instantly that she was healed. After which, prayers being made for her, she received a portion of the Sacrifice, and was restor'd to her former health. These terms of *some portion of the Sacrifice*, and of a little part of the moistned Body of the Lord by the Priest; cannot be understood of the true Body of Jesus Christ; of necessity then the Bread by this Author must be called by the name of the Body of Jesus Christ; and by consequence he believed it remained in the Sacrament after Consecration.

Hesychius, one of the Priests of the Church of Jerusalem, in the year 480, saith in the second Book on *Leviticus*, ch. 8. This Mystery (speaking of the Eucharist) is at once Bread and Flesh, *illud Mystrium simul panis & caro*. In this same place he saith, it was the custom of the Church of Jerusalem in his time, to burn what remained after the Communion.

Hesychius.

Procopius of Gaza, who in all likelihood wrote in the end of the fifth Century, expounding these words of *Genesis*, where *Jacob* saith to *Juda*, *His eyes be red with wine, and his teeth white with milk, &c.* applying them to our Blessed Saviour in the Mystery of the Sacrament, saith, *that 'tis a Metaphor taken from those that having drank, are the merrier for it, &c.* and saith that the holy Scriptures would denote the gladness which the Lord left to his Disciples in giving them the Mystical Wine by the words of Institution, *Take, drink ye all of this: These words*, saith he, *do shew that Jesus Christ doth with mercy look on all those that believe in him, because 'tis the nature of wine to make every one merry.* And upon these words, *his teeth are white as milk; milk*, saith he, *doth denote to us the whiteness and purity of the mystical nourishment; for Jesus Christ gave to his Disciples the Image of his true Body; not desiring any of the bloody sacrifices of the Law; he would by the white teeth, signifie to us the purity of the food wherewith we are nourished; for according to holy David, Sacrifice and burnt-offerings thou wouldest not, but a Body hast thou prepared me.*

ProcopiusGazens.

mark this

When *Procopius* speaketh of the Mystical Wine that rejoyced the Disciples, it being the nature of Wine to make merry; this Mystical Wine is not the Blood of Jesus Christ, for 'tis not the nature of Blood to rejoyce. It must therefore be meant, that *Procopius* said, by the Wine which Jesus Christ distributed to his Disciples, was to be understood

A G E V.

Procopius.

derstood *true Wine*: and by the *whiteness* of the *Mystical food*; he meant the *whiteness* of the *Bread* which is both food and Image, which cannot be understood of the *true Body* of Jesus Christ, which is neither the *Image* of himself, nor *bodily food*; nor of the accidents, which cannot nourish the *Body*, because nourishment proceedeth from matter:

The same *Procopius* in his *Commentary on Esay*, expounding these words of the Prophet, *Chap. 3. The Lord of Hosts will take away from Judah and Jerusalem the staff of Bread and Water*; saith, that in the first place these words of the Prophet may be understood of Jesus Christ, and of his *Flesh and Blood*. The *Bread* being to be understood of him of whom *David* saith, *He gave them bread from Heaven*; and the waters, of those of which Jesus Christ said to the *Samaritan*, *Whoever drinketh of this water, it shall be a fountain flowing unto everlasting Life*. Then he adds, *There is another bread which giveth life to the world, which was taken from the Jews; and another water, which is that of Baptism*. Now by this other bread which was taken from the *Jews*, he means that of the *Eucharist*; and whereas he distinguisheth it from the bread, which is the *Lord*, as he distinguisheth the water of Baptism from that which was given to the *Samaritan*; it follows, that the *Bread* of the *Eucharist* is something that is distinguished from Jesus Christ himself, the *Bread* of Heaven.

P. Gelasius.

Gelasius Bishop of *Rome*, in the year 492, wrote a *Treatise* of the two *Natures* against *Nestorius* and *Eutyches*, and he excludes *Transubstantiation*, when he saith, *that the substance or nature of Bread and Wine doth still remain*.

This work is assuredly of *Pope Gelasius*. As is confessed by *Cardinal Du Perron*, because first *Fulgentius* cites four passages of this *Treatise* as being writ by *Pope Gelasius*. And *Pope John* the Second in *Epist. ad Amænum*, also cites some passages of this Work, as being writ by *Gelasius*; and though he doth not give him the Title of *Pope*, 'tis because his name was well enough known at *Rome* when *John* the Second lived.

Resp. 1. ad
2. Interrog.
Ferr.

That

That the Fathers of the SIXTH CENTURY did not believe Transubstantiation.

Saint Fulgentius saith, *The Catholick Church doth continually offer to God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, a Sacrifice of Bread and Wine throughout all the World. For in the fleshly Sacrifices of the Old Testament, there is a type of the Flesh of Jesus Christ, which he was to offer without spot for our Sins; but in this Sacrifice, there is a Thanksgiving and commemoration of the same Flesh, which he offer'd for us, and of the Blood which he shed for us. He saith, That this Sacrifice consists in offering Bread and Wine; there must then be true Bread and Wine in this Sacrifice to be offer'd.*

*Fulgentius.
De fide ad Per.
Diac. c. 19.*

Ephraem first a Lieutenant of the Eastern part of the Empire, then made Bishop of Antioch, in the Year 526. wrote Books, which he intitled *Sacred Laws*, in the first of which disputing against the Eutychians, he saith, When our Fathers said, That Jesus Christ is compos'd of two Natures, they meant two Substances, as by two Substances two Natures. No body of any sense, but may say, that the Nature of that which is to be felt, and not felt in Jesus Christ, is the same Nature. Thus it is, that the body of Jesus Christ, which is received by Believers, doth not quit its sensible Nature, and remains without being separated from the intelligible Grace. The which he confirms by the Example of Water, which doth not lose its Nature by Consecration. This Argument is of the same kind of that we see of Theodores, and of Gelasius, whereby these three others prove, that in the Incarnation, the presence of the Word did not destroy the human Nature in Jesus Christ, as the presence of the Holy Ghost doth not destroy the Substance of Bread and Wine in the Eucharist. We may say of this Triple and same Argument, *Funiculus triplex difficile rumpitur*. Mons. de Marca, saith in reference to this passage, and of those we have instanced, of Theodores, and St. Chrysostom, that these three Authors have owned a real change of the Bread, which nevertheless leaves the Species in their natural Substance.

*Ephraem.
Apud Pho.
Bibl. cod. 229.*

*Ecclesiast. 4.
v. 12.*

Facundus Bishop of Hermiana in Africa, in the year 552. whose Books, which he wrote in Defence of the Three chapters of the Council of Chalcedon, are justly praised by Victor of Tunes in his Chronology, and by St. Isidore of Sevil, and which Father Sirmond the

*Facundus.
Lib. 9.
De viris illu-
stribus, c. 18.*

Jesuit

AGE vi.

Facundus.

Lib. 9.

Jesuit got out of the *Vatican Library*; going about to excuse *Theodore de Mopsuest*, who taught that *Jesus Christ* had taken the *Adoption* of the *Children of God*; from whence it might have been concluded, that he believed that *Jesus Christ* is only an adoptive Son, faith, *Baptism*, which is the *Sacrament of Adoption*, may be call'd *Adoption*, as we call the *Sacrament of his Body and Blood*, which is in the consecrated *Bread and Wine*, his *Body and Blood*; not that the *Bread* is properly his *Body*, and the *Cup* his *Blood*; but, because they contain in them the *Mystery* of his *Body and Blood*. Therefore, as the faithful *Servants of Jesus Christ*, receiving the *Sacrament of his Body and Blood*, are very rightly said to receive his *Body and Blood*; so also *Jesus Christ* having received the *Sacrament of the Adoption of Children*, might very well be said to have received the *Adoption of Children*.

Certainly, if the *Sacrament of Bread and Wine* is not properly the *Body of Jesus Christ*, as *Facundus* faith, but barely *Body and Blood*, as *Baptism* is *Adoption*; the *Bread and Wine* are not *Transubstantiated* into the *Eucharist*, and are but simple signs, and something that is distinguished from the *Body and Blood of Jesus Christ*.

Primasius.

Primasius Bishop of *Adruemetum in Africa*, in his *Commentary* upon the 10th Chapter of the 1st to the *Corinth*. faith, As the *Bread* which we break, is the *Participation of the body of Christ*, so also the *Bread of Idols*, is the *Participation of Devils*. Now as the *Participation of the Bread of Idols*, is no *Transubstantiation*, or real change into *Devils*: so also the *Participation of the Bread of the Lord*, is not a real and substantial change of *Bread* into the *Body of the Lord*.

The same Doctor, on the words of the 11th Chap. of the same Epistle, where 'tis said, That the Lord took *Bread* the night in which he was betrayed, relates, That *Jesus Christ* thereby gave to us the commemoration of his *Body*. And on the following words, The Lord, faith he, hath given us an Example, to the end that as often as we do this, we should think in our minds, that *Christ* died for us. It is for this end, that 'tis said to us, the *Body of Christ*, that so thinking of it, we should not be ungrateful and unthankful for his Grace. As if any one at his Death, should leave to his Friend a pledge of his Love, could be, when he saw it, refrain from Tears, if he really loved his Friend? There must therefore needs be in the *Sacrament Bread and Wine* to be Pledges of *Jesus Christ*, for he cannot be a pledge of himself.

The

That the Fathers of the SEVENTH and EIGHTH CENTURY's did not believe Transubstantiation.

Isidore Bishop of Sevil, Anno 600. saith, That by the command of Jesus Christ himself, we do call *Body and Blood*, that which being the Fruits of the Earth, is sanctified and made a Sacrament by the invisible Operation of the Holy Ghost. In the 1st Book of Ecclesiastical Offices, he saith, *That the Bread is called the Body of Jesus Christ, because it strengtens the Body, and that the Wine is called his Blood, because it increaseth Blood in the Body; and that the Bread and Wine are two visible things, which being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, do go on to be the Sacrament of the Divine Body. Now a Sacrament signifies a holy Sign. It would therefore be a strange kind of way of* Isidore, if he had believ'd the *Bread and Wine* were transubstantiated, to say, the *Bread and Wine* are two things visible, which being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, do become the Sacraments of the Divine Body. By this Language it might as well be said, That the Fathers believed that the *Water* of Baptism was transubstantiated after their Consecration.

Isidorus Hispalensis.

Orig. l. 6. c.

19.

The same Bishop saith, *Melchisedeck*, that offer'd of the Fruits of In Alleg. Ve. the Earth a Sacrifice to God, thereby represented the Priesthood ter. Test. or Reign of Jesus Christ, which is the true King of Peace, of whose *Body and Blood*, that is to say, the Oblation of *Bread and Wine*, is offer'd throughout the VWorld. And in the Treatise *De Vocat. Gentium*, cap. 26. These are not any longer Jewish Sacrifices, such as were offer'd by Aaron the Priest, which are now offer'd by Believers, but they are such Sacrifices as were presented by Melchisedeck King of Salem, that is to say, it is *Bread and Wine*, the true Sacrament of the *Body and Blood of Jesus Christ*. He saith, The Sacrament of the *Body and Blood of Jesus Christ* is *Bread and Wine*. That both the one and the other are such Sacrifices as those offer'd by Melchisedeck; there is therefore no question, but St. Isidore did not believe that the *Bread* was destroy'd in the Sacrament, because he establishes the Sacrament in the *Bread and Wine*, such as Melchisedeck had offer'd.

Beda.

In Luca 22.
 & in Marc. 14.
 & in Hom.
 quadrages. Fe-
 ria 3a palma-
 rum.

Rom. 4. 11.

Hom. ast. &c.]
 55. in Virg.
 St. Joan. Bapt.

Sedulius.

J. Damascen.

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

Beda, an English Priest, saith, That Jesus Christ having ended the Ceremony of the Ancient Passover, which was celebrated in Commemoration of the Bondage in Egypt, out of which the Jews had been deliver'd, proceeded to the new Passover, which the Church celebrates in remembrance of His Redemption, the Figure of his Body; to the end, that instead of the Flesh and Blood of the Lamb, substituting the Sacrament of his Flesh and Blood in the Figure of Bread and Wine, he might shew that it was him to whom God had sworn, and repented not, saying, Thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchisedeck. Now, continues Beda, Jesus Christ broke the Bread which he distributed to his Disciples, to shew, That the breaking of his Body did not come to pass without his good will. It appears from these words, (substituting the Sacrament of his Flesh and Blood in the Figure of Bread and Wine) that the Bread and Wine remain after Consecration, to be the Figure of the Body and Blood of Christ. As when the Apostle saith, the sign of Circumcision, *signum Circumcisionis*; That is to say, Circumcision which is a sign and a figure. So Beda maketh the Sacrament consist in the Bread and Wine. Therefore in the Homily, *De Sanctis* in Epiphania, he saith, That Jesus Christ the Heavenly Lamb, having been offer'd up, transfer'd into the Creatures of Bread and Wine, the Mystery of his Passion, and thereby became a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchisedeck. And elsewhere he saith, Melchisedeck Priest of the most High God, did long before the time of the legal Priesthood, offer up Bread and Wine. Therefore our Saviour is called Priest after the Order of Melchisedeck, because he abrogated the Sacrifices of the Law, and instituted a Sacrifice of the same kind to be under the New Testament, the Mystery of his Body and Blood. Certainly, As our Mystery is no Mystery till after Consecration; and that 'tis of the same Nature as was that of Melchisedeck, it must be concluded, that the Bread and Wine do remain in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

Sedulius a Scotchman, Author of the Commentaries upon St. Paul, and who flourished about the year 735. in his Commentary upon the first to the Corinthians, Chap. 11. saith, Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, hath left us the remembrance of himself; as if one going a far journey should leave with his Friend the pledge of his love, to remember their ancient Amity. There must then needs be something that is not Jesus Christ himself, for no one is a pledge of himself.

Damascen a Fryer, who lived about the year 750, saith in his fourth Book of Orthodox Law, Chap. 14. The Shew-bread did typifie
 this

this Bread, and 'tis this pure and unbloody Sacrifice which our Saviour foretold by the Prophet, should be offered to him from the rising of the Sun to the setting of the same, to wit, the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, which passeth into the substance of our Body and Soul, without being consumed, without being corrupted, without going into the draft, God forbid, but passing into our substance for our Preservation. Now every Body agrees this cannot be said of the proper Body of Jesus Christ. It must then be concluded, Damascen supposed that the Bread remained.

In the same place he adds, That as in Baptism, because men are wont to wash with Water, and anoint them with Oyl, God has added to the Water and Oyl, the Grace of his Holy Spirit, and has made it the washing of Regeneration; so also, they being accusom'd to eat Bread, and to drink Wine and Water, he has joined them to his Divinity, and has made them his Body and Blood.

In the same place, The Prophet Esay saw a light Coal; now the Coal is not of meer Wood, but it is joined to Fire; so also the Bread of the Eucharist is not common Bread, but it is united to the Divinity, and the Body which is united to the Divinity, is not one and the same Nature, but the Nature of the Body is one, and that of the Divinity which is united to it, is another.

In the same place, How is it that the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ, and the Wine and Water his Blood? He answers, The Holy Ghost comes and disposes these things after such a manner as surpasseth our Thoughts and Expressions. The Bread and Wine are taken, *Panis & Vinum assumuntur*, in Greek *παρλαμβεται*, a word used by St. Athanasius to express the Hypostatical Union. Now these kinds of Expressions of Damascen do imply, that the Bread and Wine do remain in the Sacrament.

The Council of Constantinople composed of 338 Bishops, held in the viiith Century, for regulating the business of Image-worship, having condemn'd their use, they would by the way explain the Doctrine of the Church touching the Eucharist, and to draw a proof against those very Images, they call it the true Image of Jesus Christ; they say he gave it to his Disciples to be a Type of the evident Commemoration of his Death; they say that Jesus Christ chose no other Species under Heaven, nor no other Type that should express his Incarnation. Behold then, say they, the Image of his quickned Body, which was made after a precious and honourable manner. They affirm, that as the Word did not take a Person,

Concil. Constantin. Act. 6.

A G E. viii.

Conc. Const.

that so the addition of a Person might not be made to the Divinity: so also he appointed, that an Image should be offered, which is a chosen matter, to wit, the *Substance of Bread*, that has not the Figure of Man, to avoid giving occasion of Idolatry: As then, say they, the Body of Jesus Christ which is according to Nature, is Holy, as having been Deified; so also 'tis apparent, that that Body also that is by Institution, is Holy, and it's Image is Holy, as having been Deified by Grace, by a kind of Sanctification. They maintain, that as the Human Nature was Deified by its Union with the Word, so also the *Bread* of the Sacrament, as the true Image of the natural Flesh of Jesus Christ, is sanctified by the coming of the Holy Ghost, and becomes the Body of Jesus Christ, *because the Priest transfers the Oblation from the state of a common thing, to something that is Holy.* To conclude, they clearly distinguish the natural Flesh of Jesus Christ, which is living and intelligent, from his Image, which is the Heavenly Bread, filled with the Holy Spirit. All these continued Expressions are so far from any Idea of *Transubstantiation*, that one must needs see, that the *destruction of the Bread and Wine* in the Sacrament, was not believed by the Fathers of the Council, nor by the Church in their time.

Alcuinus.

Ep. 69.

Alcuin speaking of the Consecrating of Bread and Wine to be the Body and Blood of Christ, saith, that the Sanctification of this Mystery doth foreshew to us the effect of our Salvation: *That by the Water is signified the Christian People; by the grains of the Wheat ground into Meal to make Bread, is meant the Union of the Universal Church which is made one Body by the Fire of the Holy Ghost, which unites the Members to the Head; and that by the Wine is shewed the Blood of the Passion of the Lord.* Doubtless *Alcuin* did not believe *Transubstantiation*, seeing he places in the *Bread and Wine*, the signification of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; and that he saith by the *Wine* is shewed the Blood of Jesus Christ; for that which is a Figure, and that which is figured; that which sheweth, and that which is shewed, are two different things, the one of which is not the other. Therefore the same *Alcuin* doth formally distinguish the Eucharist from the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, when he saith after *St. Austin*, *Whosoever abideth not in Jesus Christ, and he in whom Christ abideth not, doubtless doth not spiritually eat his Flesh, altho he visibly and carnally eats with his teeth the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.*

In Joan: c. 13.
v. 15.

Charles

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

447

Charles the great, his Disciple, writing to the same *Alcuin*, calls the Eucharist, the Figure of the Body and Blood of the Lord. The Lord, saith he, being at Supper with his Disciples, broke Bread, and gave likewise the Cup, in figure of his Body and Blood; and by this means offered us a very profitable Sacrament: Now whatever he said of the figure it contain'd, or that it contain'd not the truth, the figure was never the same as the thing is that's figured.

A G E viii.

Carol. M.

De Offic. Sep-
tuag. ad Al-
quin.

In the *Ambrosian* Office which was abolish'd in the year 796, there was this Clause, which is still to be seen in the fourth Book of St. *Ambrose* his Sacraments; *Nobis hanc oblationem adscriptam rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod est figura Corporis & Sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.*

Ambrosian
Office.

The Ancient *Roman* Order doth frequently call the Bread and *Vine*, the Body and Blood of the Lord; but it sufficiently shews by these manner of expressions, that it doth not mean that the Bread and *Vine* are the same thing with the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; for in the first place it saith, that the Sub-Deacons when they see the Chalice wherein is the Blood of the Lord cover'd with a Cloth, and when the Priest hath said these words at the end of the Lords Prayer, *libera nos a malo*, they should go from the Altar, and prepare Chalice and clean Cloths to receive the Body of the Lord, *fearing lest it should fall to the ground, and crumble to dust*. Now who doth not see that this cannot be spoken but of the Bread, figuratively and improperly called the Body of Jesus Christ? 2ly, It saith, That the Bishop breaketh the Oblation on the right side, and that he leaveth the part which he brake, on the Altar: Now who can say that the Body of Jesus Christ can be broke into parts? 3dly, The Fraction being made, the Deacon receives from the Sub-Deacon the Cup, and carries it to the Chair, that the Bishop might communicate, who having communicated, puts part of the holy Oblation of which he bit a morsel, into the Arch-Deacons hands. Can it be said that one doth bite the true Body of Jesus Christ, and that one breaks off part of it? 4sly, It adds, *he is to take great heed that no part of the Body and Blood of the Lord doth remain in the Chalice, or on the Plate*. By these words, the *Roman* Order gives us to understand, that it speaks of such a Body and Blood that a part of it may be separated from the whole: Now this is what can only be said of the Bread and *Vine*, improperly called the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.

Ordo Romanus

The

AGE viii.

Ordo Romanus.

The now Roman Order at present used in the Church of Rome, doth also furnish us with the like reflections. It expressly marketh, That Jesus Christ gave in the Oblation, *Bread and Wine*, to celebrate the Myſteries of his *Body and Blood*. Therein is deſired, That this Bleſſed Oblation may be accepted of God in ſuch a manner, as that it might be made to us the *Body and Blood* of Jesus Christ; after all which, is recited the History of the Inſtitution, and the Sacramental words. The Eucharist is called, *the Sacred Bread of Eternal Life; and the Cup, the Cup of everlasting Salvation*. To conclude, They pray God to behold thoſe Gifts, and that he will accept them as he did the offering of *Abel*, and the Sacrifice of *Melchizedek*, which it's very well known, was *Bread and Wine*. All which doth plainly ſhew, That the Roman Order at this time obſerved, cannot reaſonably be interpreted, but in ſuppoſing that the *Bread and Wine remain in the Eucharist after Conſecration*.

That the Fathers of the NINTH CENTURY did not believe Transubstantiation.

AGE ix.

Theodorus Studita.

Theodorus Studita, as is related by Michael Studita in Baronius, in the year 816. N. 15. ſeeing himſelf reduced to the extremity of being ſtarv'd, ſaid to his Diſciple, *If men are ſo cruel as to make me periſh with hunger, the participation of the Body and Blood of the Lord, which is the ordinary food of my Body and Soul, ſhall be my only nourishment*: Now the real Body of Jesus Christ cannot be the nourishment of the Body; therefore of neceſſity this Author muſt be underſtood to ſpeak of *Bread*, which is his Body figuratively and improperly. It is what is alſo confirm'd by this Michael Studita, who ſaith in the ſame place, that Theodore had always about him, *ſome parcels of the quickning Body of the Lord*; which cannot be meant of the true Body of Jesus Christ, which is not now ſubject to be broken, nor divided.

Abyro.

Abyro Biſhop of Baſil, ſent Ambaſſador by Charlemaine in the year 814, to Conſtantinople, to Treat a Peace with the Emperor of the Eaſt, as is declared by the Annals of France, by Eginhart Author of the Life of Charlemaine, the Annals of Fulda, Herman Contract, and others. This Abyro died in the year 836, and left a Capitulary for inſtruction of the Priests of his Dioceſs, publiſh'd by

Dom

Dom Luke D'achery in the Sixth Tome of his *Spicilegium*, pag. 692. now amongst many other Instructions he gives his Priests in his Capitularies, this is one: 'In the fifth place, the Priest should know what the Sacrament of *Baptism* and *Confirmation* is, and also what the Mystery of the *body* and *blood* of our Lord doth mean. How a visible creature is seen in the same Mysteries, and is nevertheless the invisible. Salvation is communicated for the Souls eternal happiness, which is contained in faith only. By *visible creature*, he can only mean a creature, not in appearance, but effective; for otherwise, according to this Author, it must be said that in *Baptism*, and *Confirmation*, there should be only an apparent creature, and not the substance of *water* and *christ*. Besides, *Abyto* attributed the same effect to these three Sacraments, to wit, the communication of eternal and invisible Salvation to them that with *faith* do receive these holy Sacraments.

Theodulphus in the year 810, Bishop of Orleans, saith in his Treatise of the Order of Baptism, 'There is one saving Sacrifice which Melchisedeck also offer'd under the Old Testament, in Type of the *body* and *blood* of our Saviour, the which the Mediator of God and Man accomplished under the New, before he was crucify'd, when taking the bread and wine he blessed and gave them to his Disciples, commanding them to do those things in remembrance of him. It is this Mystery which the Church doth celebrate, having put an end to the ancient sacrifices, offering bread, because of the bread which came down from Heaven; and wine, because of him which said, I am the true Vine; to the end that by the visible Oblation of Priests, and by the invisible consecration of the Holy Ghost, the bread and wine should have the dignity of the *body* and *blood* of our Lord, with which blood there is mingled some water, either because there came out of the side of our Saviour water with the blood; or because according to the Interpretation of our Ancestors, as Jesus Christ is signify'd by the wine, so also the people is signify'd by the water. Now this Bishop, saying that Jesus Christ gave bread to his Disciples in commemoration that this Mystery is an Oblation of visible bread which is consecrated by the Holy Spirit, and which receiveth the dignity of the *body*; that he indifferently calls the *blood*, *wine*, and the *wine*, *blood*; that with the *blood*, *water* is mingled, and that Jesus Christ is signify'd by the *wine*; that 'tis said the *wine* signifies Jesus Christ, as the *water* doth the people; these words cannot suppose any Transubstantiation.

Theodulphus.

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

The Opposers of *Paschasius Radbertus* Frier of the Monastery of *Corby*, who wrote a Book of the *body and blood of Jesus Christ*, did not believe *Transubstantiation*. That the said *Paschasius* had several adversaries, appears by his own Writings, for towards the end of his Commentary upon *St. Matthew*, he saith himself, *I have enlarged upon the Lords Supper a little more than the brevity of a Commentary would permit, because there be several others that are of a different judgment touching these holy Mysteries, and that several are blind, and do not perceive that this bread and-cup is nothing else but what is seen with the eyes, and tasted with the palate.* And in his Epistle to *Frudegard*, as well as in his Commentary on *St. Matthew*, ch. 12. it appears he had Opposers, because in his Epist. to *Frudegard*, he saith, *You advise with me touching a thing that many do make doubt of.* And in his Commentary, *I am told that many, saith he, do censure me, as if I had attributed to the words of our Lord, either more, or something quite contrary to what the genuine sense permits.* So that *Paschasius* had adversaries, and they did not believe *Transubstantiation*, because they held that in the Eucharist, *there was only the virtue of the flesh, and not the very flesh; the virtue of the blood, and not the very blood of Christ. That the Eucharist was figure, and not verity; shadow of the body, and not the body it self.* They would, saith *Paschasius*, *extenuate the word, body, and perswade, Quod non sit vera caro Christi, sed quædam virtus & figura corporis Christi.* Now *Paschasius Radbertus* was the first Author that wrote fully and seriously of the truth of the *body and blood of Jesus Christ* in the Eucharist, as *Bellarmin* saith, *de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis in Paschasio Radberto.* And *Father Sirmond* saith, he is the first that hath explain'd the sense of the Church touching this *Mystery*; so that, saith he, he hath opened the way to others, *In vitæ Radberti præfixa ejus operibus.* Therefore it is nothing strange that *Paschasius* had enemies, and that he was accused for departing from the common Faith, and to have spread abroad Visions of a young Man. For he saith to *Frudegard*, *You have, saith he, at the end of this Work, the Authorities of Catholick Fathers succinctly marked, by which you may perceive, that 'twas not through rashness, that formerly when I was young, I believed these things, but by Divine authority.* He also endeavours to clear himself from this charge in alledging passages, as of *Saint Austin*, the which nevertheless are not to be found in him; as these words, *Receive in the Bread what hung on the Cross, receive in the Cup what issued out of the side of Jesus Christ.* Which is not to be found in *St. Austin*.

Raba-

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

451

AGE ix.

Rabanus.

Rabanus Archbishop of Mayance in the year 847; filed by *Baronius* in the year 843. N. 31. the bright Star of Germany, *Fulgens Germaniæ Sidus*; faith in his institution of Clerks *Lib. 1. cap. 31.* Our Saviour liked better that believers should receive with their mouth the Sacraments of his Body and Blood, and that they should be turned into their nourishment, to the end that by the visible work the invisible effect should be shewn. For as the material food, doth materially nourish the Body and support it, so also the Word of God doth nourish the Soul inwardly, and doth strengthen it. And in the same place, The Sacrament is one thing, and the virtue of the Sacrament is another. The Sacrament is turned into the nourishment of the Body, but by the virtue of the Sacrament one acquires everlasting life. As the Sacrament therefore is turn'd into our selves, when we do eat and drink it, so also we are converted into the Body of Jesus Christ, when we live with Piety and Obedience.

The same Doctor on *St. Matthew*, Chap. 26. faith with Venerable *Beda*, that Jesus Christ hath substituted instead of the Flesh and Blood of the Paschal Lamb, the Sacrament of his Body and Blood. That the Creator of the World, and the Redeemer of Mankind, making of the very fruits of the Earth, that is to say, of Bread and Wine, a fit Mystery, turn'd it into the Sacrament of his Body and Blood, that unleavened Bread and Wine mixt with water, must be sanctified to be the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.

Afterwards he gives the reason wherefore our Saviour chose Bread and Wine to make them Sacraments of his Flesh and Blood, and faith, that 'tis because *Melchisedeck* offer'd Bread and Wine, and that Jesus Christ being a Priest after the Order of *Melchisedeck*, he was to imitate his Oblation. And shewing the Reason why the Sacrament takes the name of the Body and Blood of the Lord, he faith with *Isidore* Archbishop of Sevil, 'Tis because Bread strengthens the Body, it is conveniently called the Body of Jesus Christ; and because Wine augments Blood in the Flesh and Veins, for this reason it is compar'd to the Blood. Now both these things are visible, notwithstanding being sanctifi'd by the Holy Ghost, they pass into the Sacrament of the Divine Body. A Sacrament which in the 33. Chap. he calls the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, in opposition to his Natural Body, from which he distinguishes it, and draws a resemblance from the Mystical Body, to the proper Body of Jesus Christ. The holy Vessels, faith he, are set on the Altar, viz. the Cup and Patten, which in some sort are the figure of the Grave of Jesus Christ; for as at that time the Body of

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

Jesus Christ was laid in the Sepulcher, having been embalm'd by godly People; so also at present, the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, as it were imbalm'd with holy Prayers, is kept in the holy Vessels to be administered to Believers by the hands of the Ministers.

The same Doctor in his Penitential, or Letter to *Heribald Bishop of Auxerre*, which *Monsieur Baluze* got printed at the end of his *Regino* at *Paris* in 1671, saith, Chap. 33. *As to what you demand of me, whether the Sacrament after it is eat and consum'd, and cast into the draught after the manner of all other meats, does return to the former nature it had before 'twas consecrated at the Altar: to such a needless question may be reply'd, The Lord himself said in the Gospel, that what enters into the Body goes into the Belly, and is cast into the draught. As for the Sacrament of the Body and Blood, it is made of corporeal and visible things, but it produceth an invisible sanctification, as well to the Body as to the Soul. What reason is there, that that which is digested in the Stomack, and is cast out into the draught, should return to its former state, there being never any that affirmed that such a thing was done? For of late some persons not having a right Judgment of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, have said, that the same Body, and the same Blood of the Lord which was Born of the Virgin Mary, and in which the Lord suffered on the Cross, and rose again from the Dead, is the same which is taken at the Altar; against which Error we have as much as was necessary written to the Abbot *Egilon*, explaining what ought truly to be believed of the Body of Christ in the Eucharist.*

Amalarius.

Amalarius, esteemed a very Learned man, in the Manuscripts cited by *Dom Luke D'achery* a Learned *Benedictin*, in his Preface to the Seventh Tome of his *Spicilegium*, was sent by the Emperor *Charles le Debonnair* to Pope *Gregory* to find out Antiphonaries, (*Amalar. in Prolog. Antiphon.*) and who by express command of the same Emperor, was chosen in a Council held at *Aix la Chappel*, Anno 816. to make Rules for Prebends, as is testified by *Ademar* a Monk of *Angoulism*, in his Chronicle on the year 816, saith in his Treatise of Church-Offices, Lib. 3. cap. 25. That the Sacrament is to us instead of Jesus Christ. The Priest, saith he, bows and recommends to God the Father, that which was offered in the room of Jesus Christ. In the 26th chap. he saith, The Oblation and the Cup, do signifie the Body of the Lord, when Jesus Christ said, This is the Cup of my Blood, he sanctified his Blood, which Blood was in the Body, as the Wine is in the Chalice. In the third Book, chap. 25. he calls the

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

453

AGE ix.

Amalarinus.

*Amal. ad Ran-
gari, Tom. 7.
Spicilegii, pag.
166.*

the Eucharist, the Sacrament of Bread and Wine: and saith, that *Jesus Christ hath in this Bread recommended his Body, and in the Cup, his Blood.*

The same *Amalarinus* having been consulted by *Rangari* Bishop of *Noyon*, how he understood those words of Institution of the Eucharist, *This is the Cup in my Blood of the New and Eternal Testament*, with this addition which is in the Canon of the Mass, *the Mystery of Faith*; answers him by a Letter, wherein after having spoken of the Cup of the Passover, he proceeds to that of the Eucharist; and having alledged what is mention'd by *St. Luke*, he adds, *'The Cup is in type of my Body, wherein is the Blood that shall run out of my side, to accomplish the ancient Law; and after it is shed, it shall be the New Testament.* And a little lower he saith, *'The Mystery is Faith, as St. Austin saith in his Letter to the Bishop Boniface, as the Sacrament of the Body of Jesus Christ is in some manner the Body of Jesus Christ, and the Sacrament of his Blood, his Blood; so the Sacrament of Faith, is Faith.* So also we may say, *This is the Cup of my Blood of the New and Eternal Testament.* As if he should say, *This is my Blood which is given for you.*

The same Doctor in a Letter which he wrote to one *Gontard*, whom he calls his Son, saith, *'That it is our Saviours good pleasure to shed his Blood by the Members and Veins, for our Eternal Salvation. That is a Body of Jesus Christ that may be cast out in spitting after having receiv'd it, and of which, a part may be flung out of the mouth.* To all which he adds, *having so received the Body of the Lord with a good intention; I don't pretend to dispute, whether he be invisibly lifted up to Heaven, or whether he remains in our Body, till the day of our Death, or whether he evaporates into the Air, or whether he issues out of the Body with the Blood, or whether he goes out at the pores; our Saviour saying, All that enters in at the Mouth, goes down into the Belly, and from thence into the draught, &c.*

Now when this great Man saith, That the Sacrament is to us in the stead of Jesus Christ; that what is offered in the Eucharist is sacrific'd instead of Jesus Christ; that the Cup is in Type of the Body; that the Blood is in the Body, as the Wine is in the Cup; that Jesus Christ represents his Body by the Bread, and his Blood in the Wine; that the Sacrament of the Body is in some sort his Body, and that 'tis so that the Cup of the Blood is his Blood, that the Body is poured forth upon our Members for our Salvation; that there is a Body of Jesus Christ that may be cast out by spitting, and whereof

AGE ix.

Amalarius.

some part may be flung out of the Mouth; That he will not dispute whether this *Body* evaporates in the Air, or whether it departs out of the *body* with the *blood*, or whether it goes out 'at the pores, or into the Draft; all this doth sufficiently shew, That this Doctor distinguished the *Bread and Wine*, as a *Typical body*, from the *real Body* of Jesus Christ; and that by consequence, he believed the *bread* and *wine* remained after Consecration, to be called the *body and blood* of Jesus Christ, but improperly.

Valafridus

Strabo

Lib. de Reb.

Ecclef. c. 16.

Bill. p. 7. To.

12.

Valafridus Strabo, Abbas Augiensis, stiled a very Learned Man, by Herman Contracted, in the year 849. 'Jesus Christ, said he, 'gave to his Disciples the Sacrament of his Body and Blood in the substance of Bread and Wine, teaching them to celebrate it in remembrance of his most holy Passion, because there could nothing be found fitter than these things to signify the Unity of the Head and Members; for as Bread is made of sundry Grains, and brought into one Body by means of Water; and as the Wine is squeez'd from several Grapes, so also the Body of Jesus Christ is made of the Union of a multitude of Saints. And a little after, he declares, That Jesus Christ hath chose for us a very fit Sacrifice, for the Mystery of his Body and Blood, in that Melchisedeck having offer'd Bread and Wine, he gave to his Children the same kinds of Sacraments. And afterwards, cap. 18. That for that great Number of Legal Ordinances, Jesus Christ gave us the Word of his Gospel; so also instead of the great diversity of Sacrifices, Believers are to rest satisfied with the sole Oblation of Bread and Wine.

It is evident Strabo makes the Holy Sacrament to consist in the substance of Bread and Wine, which according to him, is differenced from the Body, because it is but the memorial of it: That 'tis the Figure, that it consists in being made of sundry Grains, and the Wine of sundry Grapes. That the Sacrifice of the New Testament, is of the same kind as that of Melchisedeck, and that the Eucharist is an Oblation of Bread and Wine. All these things intimate, that the Bread and Wine remain in the Eucharist after Consecration.

Herribald.

Tom. 2. ch.

19. 52. and 61.

Herribald was Bishop of Auxerre, in the time that Valafridus Strabo wrote. Now he was of the same Opinion with Rabanus. Thomas Waldensis assures us so. Herribald of Auxerre, saith he, and Rabanus of Mayence say, That the Sacrament of the Eucharist goes into the Draft. The Anonymous Author, contemporary with Herribald, which was published by Father Cellor the Jesuit, saith also

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

55

also the same. Nevertheless *Lupus* Abbot of *Ferriers*, Ep. 19. speaking of him, calls him a most excellent Prelate, *excellentiſſimum Praefulum*. In the 37th Ep. he ſtiles him a Man of a lofty and Divine underſtanding, *Altiffimi & Divini ingenii*. And *Hincmarus* Archbiſhop of *Reims*, calls him the Biſhop of Venerable Qualities. So that the very Chronicle of *Auxerre* intimates, that there was engrav'd on his Monument this Inſcription, *Here lies the body of St. Herribald*. Therefore the Author of the 1st Treatiſe of the Perpetuity of the Eucharist, ſaith in pag. 843, That *Herribald* and *Rabanus*, were Adverſaries to *Paschasius*: Tho in the 2d Treatiſe of the Perpetuity, in pag 842. he ſaith, ſpeaking of the Miniſter *Claude*, Who told him, that *Amalaricus* and *Herribald* were in any wiſe Adverſaries to *Paschasius*?

It appears by the Letter *Paschasius* wrote to *Frudegard*, that he was not of the ſame Judgment *Paschasius* was of, ſeeing he oppoſes to him *St. Auſtin's* 23d Letter to *Boniſace*, *Sic Wideſort contra Wickliſſ*, ad Art. 1.

* *Ratramne*, Prieſt and Frier of *Corby*, experienc'd in the Scriptures, equally eſteem'd for his Learning and Manners, whom * *Hincmar*, || *Lupus* Abbot of *Ferriers*, his Contemporaries ; . . *Sigebert* ſpeaking of in the xi. Century, and Father † *Cellus* the Jeſuits Anonimus, do all make mention of, under his true name of *Ratramnus*; wrote a Book under the Reign of *Charles the Bald*, as is reported by the ſame *Trysbemius*, which he intitl'd, *Of the Body and Blood of the Lord*: From a Monk of *Corby*, he was made Abbot of *Ovias*. The Preſident : . . *Manguin* ſpeaking of him, ſaith, he was a Learned Doctor of the Church, eminent in Probity, and in Doctrine, an undaunted defender and protector of the Catholick Truth, againſt Innovators. He dedicated his Book to the Emperor *Charles the Bald*. Now this Author did not believe *Transubstantiation*, becauſe he ſaith, ' *For as to the ſubſtance of thoſe Creatures, they are after Conſecration what they were before; they were before Bread and Wine, and it is plainly ſeen, that after Conſecration theſe created ſubſtances do remain in the very ſame ſpecies.*

And a little after he ſaith, ' *This ſpiritual fleſh which ſpiritually feeds Believers, is made of grains of Wheat, by the hands of the Baker*, iſtiled a learned *Benedictin* Defender of Grace, a Man of great Wiſdom and Reputation; and in the firſt treatiſe of the Perpetuity, p. 3. c. 3. he is ſtilled an obſcure kind of a perſon; that evaporated himſelf in obſcure Reasonings, which he added to thoſe of the Church, and explained as he pleaſed himſelf, as ſome are pleaſed to ſay.

A G E ix.
Herribald.

De Praed ch. 6,

Frudegardus.

Ratramnus.

* *Trybem. de Script. Ecclef.*
† De Praed. Ep. 79.

. . De Script. Ecclef.
‡ De Euch. ch. 1.

. . *Maug. differ. Hiſt & Chron.*
c. 17. tom. 2.
pag. 133. & 135.

Ratramnus in the Apology of the Fathers,

ſuch

AGE ix.

Ratramnus.

such as it appears to our sight; but it hath neither Bones nor sinews; nor no distinction of parts, nor is it enliven'd with a Soul, or reasonable substance. To conclude, it is unable to move of it self, and if it gives life, it is the effect of a Spiritual virtue; of an invisible, and a Divine Virtue and Efficacy. A little after he saith again, As the Water represents the People in the Sacrament, if it were true, that the Bread consecrated by Ministers was corporally changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, it must also necessarily follow, that the Water which is mingled with it were changed into the Blood of the faithful people; for where there is but one Sanctification, there ought to be but one Operation; and the Mystery should be equal where the Reason of the Mystery is the same. It is evident there is no corporal change in the Water, and by consequence, there is no corporal change to be expected in the wine. All that is said of the Body of the people represented by water, is understood spiritually; it is then a necessary consequence, that what is said of the Blood of Jesus Christ represented by the wine, must be understood spiritually. Again, The things which differ amongst themselves, are not one and the same thing. The Body of Jesus Christ which was dead and rose again, and become immortal, doth dye no more, Death has no more dominion over it, it is Eternal, and can no more suffer; but that which is celebrated in the Church is temporal and not eternal, and it is corruptible and not incorruptible. And again; it must then be said, that the body of Jesus Christ, such as it is made in the Church, was incorruptible and eternal. Nevertheles it cannot be denied that what is so cut into morsels to be eat, changed and corrupted, and that being eat with the teeth, it goes into the Body. Again, Now 'tis true that the figure and the reality are things distinct, therefore the body and blood which are celebrated in the Church, are different from the flesh and blood of the Body of Jesus Christ, which it is well known, is glorious since his Resurrection, therefore the body that we celebrate is a pledge and figure.

These words of Ratramne or Bertram, are so clear, that it is wonder'd the Author of the Perpetuity should say in the first Treatise, p. 3. that Bertram is an obscure Author, and not evidently favourable to Calvinists, but that the Catholics may explain him in a good sense. I cannot tell what to call this Confidence.

John Erigena.

John Erigena, a Scotch man, whom the Emperor Charles the Bald commanded to write touching the Body and Blood of the Lord, as he had done also to Ratramnus, which appears by Berenger's Letter to Richard, published by James Lake D. D. in the

2d Tome of his *Spicileg*, was of an Opinion contrary to *Paschasius*, as is acknowledged by * *Lanfrank*; and *Berenger* in his Epistle to the same *Lanfrank*; and *Hincmar* saith of *John Erigen*, that he taught, || *That the Sacrament of the Altar was not the real Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, but only the Remembrance both of the one and the other*: And *Berenger* writing to *Lanfrank*, saith to him, *If you hold John for a Heretick, whose Judgment we have been inform'd of touching the Sacrament, you must also hold for Hereticks, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Austin, not to mention many more. Nevertheless* * *William of Malmesbury*, || *Roger de Hoveden*, and † *Matthew of Westminster*, speak of *John Scot*, as of the greatest Man of his time; and *Molanus* Professor in Divinity at the University of *Louvain*, in his Appendix to the Martyrology of *Ussart*, at the Letter F has left these Words engraven, *John Scot, Martyr, translated Dionysius's Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, after which by Authority of the Popes, he was put into the number of the Martyrs of Jesus Christ*. To conclude, the Roman Martyrology, which we have in our Library, Printed at *Antwerp*, Anno 1586. by order of *Gregory* the 13th, as is said in the Title of the Book, *Martyrologium Romanum Jussu Gregorii 13, editum*, at the 4 of the Ides of November, makes mention of *John Scot*: It's true, the Author of the 1st Dissertation upon *John Scot*, which the Author of the *Perpetuity* chose, having placed the said Dissertation at the end of his 2d Treatise, to which he often refers his Readers, has made in the same Dissertation, a Chapter which bears the Title, that *John Scot* was not put into the Catalogue of Martyrs by the sacred Authority of Popes, and that his Name is not to be found in any Edition of the Roman Martyrology. But it is also certain, that the same Author, who hath also publish'd the belief of the Greek Church touching *Transubstantiation*, has inserted in the end of his Book, a Treatise Entituled, *A Refutation of the Answer of a Minister of Charenton, to the Dissertation which is in the end of Monsieur Arnauds Book, concerning the Employments, the Martyrdom, and the Writings of John Scot, or Erigen*; and the last Chapter of this Refutation hath this Title, *A sincere Declaration of the Author touching some things he had said in his Dissertation, the which he since confesses were not true*. And in Numb. 6. of this Chapter, the Author saith in these Terms, in Art. 7. p. 25. (he speaks of the 7th Art. of the first Dissertation upon *John Scot*, which is at the end of Mr. *Arnauds Perpetuity*;) it is said that 'tis false that there was a Martyrology Printed at *Antwerp* by

AGE ix.

Jo Erigena.

* De Euchar.

|| De praedest. chap. 41.

* De Gest. Reg.

Angl. l. 1. c. 3.

|| Annal. per

pred. ad 882.

† Ad. An. 883.

AGE ix.

F. Erigena.

by command of Gregory the 13th in the Year 1586. 2dly, That there is not to be found in any Roman Martyrology, Printed at Antwerp or any where else, the Commemoration of John Scot on the 4th of the Ides of November. It would be superfluous here to relate the Reasons that they have had, so positively to deny these matters of Fact. It is sufficient to observe, First, That there is a Roman Martyrology set forth by Order of Gregory the 13th, and Printed by Platin at Antwerp in the Year 1586. 2dly, That there is seen in this Martyrology, the Commemoration of John Scot on the 4th of the Ides of November in these words, *Eodem Die Sancti Joannis Scoti qui Grævis puerorum confessor, Martyrii Coronam adeptus est.* This Author is of good reputation, and doubtless was not ignorant of what St. Austin saith in some of his Works, *That to Lye in a matter of Religion, is meer Blasphemy.* Nevertheless we may observe, before proceeding any farther, that if Scot had advanced any new Doctrine, he would certainly have been reproved for it by the Church of Lyons, by Prudentius, by Florus, by the Councils of Valence and Langres, which condemn'd and censur'd his Opinions on the Doctrine of Predestination.

Prudentius.

St. Prudentius Bishop of Troy in Champaign, who assisted at the Councils of Paris in the Year 846, of Tours in 849, at Soissons in the Year 853. to whom Leo the 4th wrote an honourable Letter, which is to be seen in the 6th Tome of the Councils, of the which the Bishop of Toul in the French Martyrology on the 7th of April, having said, that at Troy his Anniversary is solemnized, as of a holy Bishop and Confessor; he also makes a magnificent Elegy of him. This holy Bishop, I say, was of the same Judgment with John Scot in the Subject of the Eucharist, for Hincmar Arch-bishop of Rheims, numbers him with John Scot, against whom he observes nevertheless, that he wrote touching Predestination, and saith, that they both held, *That the Sacraments of the Altar are not the true Body and Blood of our Lord, but only the commemoration of his Body and Blood.*

Hincmar de
Prædest. c. 31.Christianus
Drutmarus.

Christianus Drutmar Priest and Frier of Corby, famous for his Learned Works, saith Sigebert of Illustrious Men, as also the Abbot Trythemius; wrote a Commentary upon St. Matthew, about the year 845. It is in the Bibliotheca Patrum, Tom. 16. pag. 301. *Jesus Christ, saith Drutmar, took Bread, because Bread strengthens the heart of man, and doth better fortifie our Body than any other food. He therein establishes the Sacrament of his Love; but this propriety ought*

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

159

A^C G E ix.

Christianus
Drutmanes.

ought much rather to be attributed to the spiritual Bread which perfectly
strengthens all Men, and all Creatures, because 'tis by him we Live,
Move, and have our Being: He blessed it: He blessed it first, be-
cause as in his Person he blessed all Mankind, then afterwards he shew-
ed that the blessing and power of the Divine and Immortal Nature was
truly in that Nature which he had taken from the Virgin Mary. He
broke it: He broke the Bread which was Himself, because expressing
himself willingly to Death, he broke and shattered the Habitation of his
Soul, to the end that he might satisfie us, according to what himself saith,
I have power to lay down my Life, or to save it. And he gave it
to his Disciples, saying to them, Take and Eat, this is my Body.
He gave to his Disciples the Sacrament of his Body for the Remission of
Sins, and for the keeping of Charity, to the end that not forgetting this
action, they should always perform this in Figure, and that they should
not be unmindful of what he was about to do for them. This is my Bo-
dy, that is to say, Sacramentally; and having taken the Cup, he blef-
sed it, and gave it to his Disciples. As amongst all things which are
necessary to preserve Life, Bread and Wine are those that do most of all
repair and strengthen the weakness of Nature: It is with great reason
that our Saviour was pleas'd in these two things to establish the Myste-
ry of his Sacrament; for Wine rejoices the heart, and increases Blood,
therefore it is very fit to represent the Blood of Jesus Christ, because
whatsoever comes from him, rejoices with true Joy, and encreaseth
whatsoever there is of good in us. To conclude, as a Person that is go-
ing a long Journey, leaves to those whom he loves, some particular pledge
of his kindness, on condition that they should look daily upon it, to the end
that they may retain him always in Remembrance; so in like manner,
God by spiritually changing the Bread into his Body, and the Wine into
his Blood, has commanded us to celebrate this Mystery, that these two
things should make us never forget what he hath done for us with his
Body and Blood, and keep us from being unthankful and ungrateful
for his so tender Love. Now because water is wont to be mingled with
the Sacrament of his Blood, this Water represents the People for whom
Jesus Christ was pleas'd to suffer; and the Water is not without the
Wine, nor the Wine without the Water, because as he died for us, so
also we should be ready to die for Him, and for our Brethren, that is
to say, for the Church, therefore there came out of his side Water and
Blood.

This passage is taken out of the Commentary, where the Author
expounds these words of the Institution, *This is my Body*, by these
other

AGE ix.

Christianus
Druzmanus.

other words, That is to say, in *Sacrament*, which are words quite contray to those of *Paschasius*; for *Paschasius* said in his Letter to *Frudegard*, fearing it should be thought that *Jesus* spake in *Sacrament*, he said demonstratively, *This is my Body*. *Ne putares quia in Sacramento lequebatur (Dominus) &c. demonstrative dixit, hoc est Corpus meum*. So *Druzman* makes a difference 'twixt the *Body* and the *Sacrament* which he establishes in the *Bread* and *Wine*, which he blessed, brake and gave to his Disciples; he ascribes to the *Wine*, only the Dignity of representing the *Blood* of *Christ*; and that, to conclude, the *Bread* and *Wine* are pledges of his *Law*. Therefore the same Author, Chap. 56. on these words, *I will drink no more of this fruit of the Vine, until I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom*; from that very hour of Supper, saith he, he drank no *Wine*, until he became immortal and incorruptible after his Resurrection.

Florus Dia-
conus.

The Deacon *Florus* wrote about the same time, an Exposition of the *Mass*, which is mention'd in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Tom. 6. pag. 170. he there saith, *This Body and this Blood* is not gather'd in *Ears* of *Corn*, or in clusters of *Grapes*; nature doth not give it us, but it is Consecration that makes it Mystical to us: *Jesus Christ* is eaten when the *Creatures* of *Bread* and *Wine* do pass to the *Sacrament* of the *Body* and *Blood*, by the ineffable Sanctification of the *Holy Ghost*. He is eaten by parcels in the *Sacrament*, and remains whole and intire in *Heaven*, and whole and intire in our *Hearts*. Again, *All that is done in this Oblation* of the *Body* and *Blood* of our *Saviour*, is a *Mystery*, we there see one thing, and we understand another; what we see, hath a corporal substance; what we understand, hath a spiritual Fruit. He saith, *Jesus Christ* saith to them, take, eat ye all of this; and speaking of the *Cup*, *The Wine*, saith he, was the *Mystery* of our *Redemption*, and he proves it by these words, *I will drink no more of the Fruit of the Vine*. To conclude, Explaining these last words of the Canon, *By which, O Lord, thou daily makest these good things for us*, which contain a kind of *Thanksgiving*, which in the *Latin Liturgy* does follow the *Consecration*; he sufficiently intimates to us, that he did not believe the *Bread* and *Wine* were changed into the substance of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Jesus Christ*, seeing he speaks of them, as things God had created from the beginning of the *World*, which he creates every year by *Propagation* and *Reparation*, which he sanctifies, which he fills with *Grace* and *Heavenly Benediction*, the which himself expounds to be *Bread* and *Wine*.

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

461.

AGE ix.

See here Nine or Ten Authors, Contemporaries with *Paschasius*, which are formally contrary to his Doctrine, besides those which *Paschasius* himself speaks of in general, in his own Writings.

To conclude the Ninth Century, there might be added the manner that *Charles* the Bald, and the Count of *Barcelona* signed the Peace, which was done with the Blood of the Eucharist, as is reported by Monsieur *Baluza* in his Notes on *Agabard*, out of *Odo Aribert*, in the year 844. It was in the same manner that *Pope Theodore* in the Seventh Century signed the Condemnation of *Pirrus* the Monothelite, as appears by *Baronius* on the year 648. § 15.

That the Fathers of the TENTH CENTURY did not believe Transubstantiation.

Alferick Archbishop of *Canterbury*, about the year 940. in one of his Sermons to be seen in the Fourth Book of *Bede's Ecclesiastical History*, cap. 24. which we have Copied in the Library of *St. Victor*, saith, 'The Eucharist is not the Body of *Jesus Christ* corporally, but spiritually; not the Body in which he suffered, but the Body of which he spake, when consecrating the Bread and Wine he said, 'This is my Body, this is my Blood; he adds, the Bread is his Body, just as the Manna; and the Wine his Blood, as the Water in the Desert was.

AGE x.

Alferick A.B. Cant.

The Expurgat. Index Orders these words to be blotted out

There is another Sermon cited by some under the name of *Wolfin* Bishop of *Salisbury*, others say 'tis of *Alfric*, wherein the Author uses near the same Language. This Sacrifice, saith he, is not the Body of *Jesus Christ* wherein he suffered for us, nor his Blood which he shed, but it is spiritually made his Body and Blood, as the Manna that fell from Heaven, and the Water that sprang out of the Rock. Besides these two Testimonies, which shew what was believed of the Sacrament in *England*, there is a Sermon seen, which was read every year to the People at *Easter*, to keep in their minds the Idea of the Ancient Faith; It is almost wholly taken out of *Ratramne*; There is great difference, saith this Homily, betwixt the Body wherein *Jesus Christ* suffered, and the Body which is consecrated for the Eucharist; for the Body wherein *Jesus Christ* suffered, was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and was provided with Blood, Bones, Nerves and Skin, with bodily Members, and a reasonable Soul; but his spiritual Body, which we call

Wolpinus.

*Apud Offerium de Christi-
ana Ecclesi-
Success. &
Sacr. c. 2. p. 34.
Saxon Homily.*

AGE x.

Saxon Homily.

Eucharist, is compos'd of several Grains of Wheat, without Blood, without Bones, Nerves, and without a Soul. The Body of Christ which suffer'd Death, and rose again, shall never dye more, it is Eternal and Immortal; but the Eucharist is temporal and not eternal, it is corruptible and divided into sundry parcels, ground by the Teeth, and goes along with the other Excrements. This Sacrament is a pledg and figure; the Body of Jesus Christ is the Truth it self; we have this pledg Sacramentally until we attain to the Truth, and then the pledg shall be fulfill'd. And a little lower, If we consider the Eucharist after a corporal manner, we see 'tis a changeable and corruptible Creature; but if we consider the spiritual Virtue that is in it, we easily see that Life abides in it, and that it gives Immortality to those that receive it with Faith. There is great difference betwixt the invisible Virtue of this Holy Sacrament, and the visible Form of its proper Nature. By Nature it is corruptible Bread, and corruptible Wine, but by the Virtue of the Word of God, it is truly his Body and Blood, yet not corporally but spiritually. A little below, he explains this change, in saying, 'Jesus Christ by an invisible Virtue did change the Bread and Wine into his Body and Blood; but 'twas after the same manner as he heretofore changed Manna, and the Water that came out of the Rock, into the same Body and Blood.

Fulcinius.

Tom. 6. Spicil.
de gestis Abb.
Lob. p. 573.

Fulcinius Abbot of the Monastery of Lobes, in the County of Liege, who departed this Life in the year 990. speaking of the Eucharistical Table, saith, That 'tis the Table on which is consumed the Sacred Body of our Lord, which not being to be said of the proper Body, cannot be understood but of the Bread which is called Body, an Expression which in all likelihood this Abbot had learn'd of St. Austin, who saith, The Bread made for that use, is consumed in receiving the Sacrament. That which is set on the Table is consum'd, the holy Celebration being ended.

Herriger.

Idem tom. 6.
p. 591.

Herriger, Successor to Fulcinius, and whom he that continued the History of the Abbots of Lobes, mentions as a man whose Virtue and Knowledge was known even to Strangers, He collected, saith this Author, several Passages of Catholick Fathers against Paschasius Ratbertus, touching the Body and Blood of our Lord.

Monastery of
Cluny.

Tom. 4. in Spec.
p. 146.

The Ancient Customs of the Monastery of Cluny, Reprinted by the care of Dom Luke D' Acbery, l. 2. ch. 30. say, The outside of the Challice is carefully rub'd, lest there should the least drop of the Wine and Water remain; and being consecrated, it should fall to the ground, and perish; by which it appears they believed the Wine and Water

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

463

AGE x.

*Customs of the
Monastery of
Cluny.*

water still remain'd after Consecration, for the true Body of Jesus Christ cannot perish. Again, *The Priest divides the Host, and puts part of it into the Blood; of one moiety he communicates himself, and with the other he communicates the Deacon.* It cannot be so spoke of the Body of Jesus Christ; then after the Priest has broke the Host, he puts part of it into the Cup, after the usual manner, two parts on the Patten, and covers both the one and the other with a clean Cloath; but first of all, he very carefully rubs the Challice, and shakes it with the same hand with which he touch'd it, fearing, lest that breaking the Bread, there should rest some part of the Body of our Lord (which cannot be said of the true Body of Jesus Christ;) and elsewhere is prescrib'd what should be done, *If there chance to remain ever so little of the Body of our Saviour, which is expounded to be a very little Crum, as 'twere indivisible, and like an Atome.* To conclude, treating of the Communion of sick Folks, it is observ'd that the Body of our Lord is brought from the Church, that it is broke, and that the Priest holds on the Challice the part that he is to bring. It must needs be, that by the sence of these customs, there must be Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, that it may be broken, and improperly called Body.

*Lib. 3. Ch. 28.
p. 217.*

Ratberius Bishop of Verona saith, As to the Corporal substance which the Communicant doth receive, seeing that 'tis I that do now ask the Question, I must also answer my self; and I thereto yield; for seeing that to him that receives worthily, it is the true Body, altho one sees that the Bread is the same it was before; and true Blood, altho the Wine is seen to be the same it was: I confess I cannot say nor think, what it is to him that doth receive unworthily, that is to say, that doth not abide in God. Now the Communicant, can he receive a corporal Substance? Can one say, that one sees that the Bread is what 'twas before, if the Communicant receives no substance? It is known on the contrary, that what is seen, is not Bread nor Wine.

*Ratberius.
De Contempt.
Canon. por.
Spicileg. Tom.
2.*

Moreover, Ratberius condemning Drunkenness and Excess in some of his Priests, saith, that some of them spew'd before the Altar of our Lord upon the Body and Blood of the Lamb; this can be understood only of the Sacrament, which borrows the Name of the thing signified, the abuse whereof reflects on him that instituted it.

That

That the Authers of the ELEVENTH CENTURY did not believe Transubstantiation.

The Author of the Life of St Genulphius.

THE Author of the Life of St. Genulphius, who in all probability lived in the beginning of the Eleventh Century, and was published by John a Bosco a Celestin Frier, relates of this Saint, That from the very Day of his Ordination, he spent the rest of his Life without tasting any Wine, except it was that he receiv'd in the Celebration of the holy Sacrament. One would not speak in this manner, and believe that there was not Wine remaining in the Cup after Consecration.

Lib. 1. Ch. 6.

Leuthericus.

Leutherick Arch-bishop of Sens, who died in the year of our Lord 1032. did not believe Transubstantiation, because we read of him in the Life of Pope John the XVII. or according to others the Eleventh, that in this Popes Life, Leutherick Arch-bishop of Sens, laid the Foundation and Elements of the Heresy of Berenger. Whence it is, that Helgald wrote in the Life of King Robert, that his Doctrine grew and increased in the World; Cresibat, saith he, in Saeculo, notwithstanding the threatnings which this Prince made to depose him from his Dignity, if he continued to teach it.

In Epistola Roberti Regis.

Fulbertus.

Fulbert, Anno Dom. 1007. Bishop of Chartres, and ordain'd by Leutherick, did not believe Transubstantiation, when he said in his 1st Epistle to Adeodatus, That Jesus Christ intending to take up his Body to Heaven, left us the Sacrament for to be a pledge of his Body and Blood. That under the visible form of the Creature, there is a secret Virtue that Operates in the holy Solemnities. That the Divine Majesty is diffus'd and spread abroad in that, which before was but a common thing, but being sanctifi'd by the heavenly Word, it inwardly becomes the Body of Jesus Christ. That this is effected by the holy Spirit that joynes, unites and binds the Sacrament to the Body of Jesus Christ, (compaginante Spiritu sancto) that the terrestrial matter surpassing the Merits of its Nature and Kind, is changed into the substance of the Body of Jesus Christ; That this change is not impossible, no more than that is, which arrives to us by Baptism, being changed into the Body of the Church; not by any priviledge of Nature, but by the purchase of Faith; Non Naturae privilegio, sed fidei precio, being the same outwardly, and changed inwardly: Of Servants

Bib. pat. rom.

Servants being become Children, being vile and abject, and all of a sudden acquiring a new Dignity. What wonder is it, that he that produced these Natures out of nothing, should convert them into the dignity of a more excellent nature, and make them pass into the substance of his Body? Now the terms of pledges of the Body and Blood of the Lord, do sufficiently shew that he made a difference betwixt the Sacrament and his Body; therefore we see before, that *Ratramne* drew the same consequence in saying, that which is a Pledge and Image, is distinct from that whereof it is an Image and Pledge. These terms of a *secreta virtute* by which it operates, of the Sacred Majesty which it spreads abroad, of the Holy Spirit that joins and unites, of the matter which is advanced to a greater dignity; and in that he confirms the change of the Bread, by that which happens to Believers in Baptism; and by that which beset the *Manna* in the wilderness; as also what he farther says to *Frudegard* in his 2d Epistle of the Communion, as of a thing whereof the Priest newly ordained, during 40 days, received a little Portion, *parvam particulam*, which might be taken by morsels, or by bits, *minutissimi sumere*, in that he calls the sanctified Bread, *Eucharist*, and that he saith, That the sanctified Bread is called the true Body of Jesus Christ; in that he saith elsewhere with *St. Austin*, That he that abides not in Jesus Christ, and in whom Jesus Christ abideth not, doth not eat his Flesh, nor drink his Blood, though he eats and drinks to his condemnation, the Sacrament of so great a thing. All this sheweth, that *Berenger* had all reason to alledg in his defence the Authority of *Fulbert*, as appears by *Berenger's* Letter to *Richard*, which Letter is printed by *Dom Luke D'Acbery* in the 2d Tomé of his *Spicilegi*. If things be so, saith *Berenger* to *Richard*, how is it that this Doctrine of the Eucharist, contained in the Writings of Bishop *Fulbert* of glorious Memory, should come to my knowledge, which some indeed imagine to be of this Bishop, but was indeed taught by *St. Austin*?

AGE xi.

Fulbertus.

Bernon Abbot of *Auge*, who about the Year 1030. wrote a Treatise of things concerning the *Masi*, saith in the 1st Chapter, That Pope *Sergius* commanded to sing the *Agnus Dei* at the Breaking of the Body of the Lord; now this being not to be understood of the proper Body of Jesus Christ, it must be understood of the Sacrament, which is the figure of his Body: They do not speak so now, they say the Sign is broken, but they do not say the body of Jesus Christ is broken: And in the 5th Chapter he saith, that we are refreshed

Bernon.

Bible of the
Fath. Tom. 10.

AGE xi.

Bruno.

refreshed with the Wine which is in the Cup, in Type of the Bloid of Jesus Christ,

Bruno Bishop of Angers, was of Berengers opinion, as appears by the 3d Tome of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, p. 319, in a Letter the Bishop of Liege writ to K. Henry against Bruno and Berenger, his Arch-Deacon. Sigebert in his Chronicle of Miræus his Edition at Antwerp, 1608, saith, That many did dispute for and against Berenger, by word of mouth, and by Writing. The Manuscript of this Chronicle, which is seen in Monsieur d'Thoms's Library saith the same: As also *Conrart de Brunwill*, apud *Surium vita Wolphelmi ad ap. Matthew of Westminster* on the year 1080, saith, That Berenger had almost corrupted all France, Italy, and England, with his Doctrine. *Matthew Paris*, and *William of Malmesbury* do affirm, That all France was full of his Doctrine. *Thomas Waldensis* relates the Acts of the

In Willel. 2.

In Willel. 1.6.3.

Tom. 2. Spicileg. p. 508.

Counail held under Gregory the 7th, wherein there was a more moderate Confession of Faith touching the Sacrament prepared, than that under Alexander the 2d, predecessor to Gregory; Berenger was forced to sign it, after which Greg. 7th. gave him Letters of Recommendation, which *Dom Luke L'Achery*, has caused to be printed in one of the Tomes of his Collection. Nevertheless it appears by the Acts, and by *Hugh de Flavigny*, in the Chronicle of *Verdun* in the 1st Tome of Father L'Abbes *Bibliothèque*, in An. 1078, that there were several in that Assembly that maintained Berengers Doctrine against *Paschasius*, that this Arch-Deacons Adversaries knew not how to answer his Reasons; as the Chronicle of Mount *Cassin* testifies, l. 3. c. 33. And *Sigonius de Regno Itali*, relates lib. 9. on the year 1059. That they were forc'd to send to the Monastery of Mount *Cassin*, for a learned Frier called *Albert*, whom Pope *Stephen*, saith *Sigonius*, made Cardinal Deacon, who being come, and not able to answer Berengers Arguments, desired a weeks time to consider of them; neither was Pope Gregory the 7th himself well satisfied with what was urged against Berenger, seeing that Cardinal *Bernon*, in the life of *Hildebrand*, and the Abbot of *Ursberg* in the year 1080, do write, That Gregory the 7th, wavering in the Faith, caus'd a Fast to be kept by his Cardinals, that it might be discover'd whether the Church of Rome, or Berenger were in the best opinion touching the Body of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament. One argument that Gregory the 7th, was not very contrary to Berenger, is, that the Abbot of *Ursberg*, and *Aventin*, that has it from *Otto Fraxinensis*, relate on the year

1080,

P Gregory 7.

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

467

1080, that thirty Bishops and Lords being assembled *apud Brixiam Nomicam*, did depose Gregory the 7th, amongst other things, for being a Disciple of Berengers. Before I end my Discourse of Berenger, it is necessary to observe, that the Confession that was extorted from him, is not maintainable, seeing that, as is related by Lanfranc and Alger, it is therein said, that Jesus Christ not only in Sacrament, but also in reality, is touched and broken by the Testb.

A G E xi.

Bruno.

I. i. c. 19.

Theophylact Arch-Bishop of Bulgary said in his time, That God, condescending to our infirmity, doth preserve the Species of Bread and Wine, and changes them into the Virtue of the Body and Blood of Christ. Also in his time the Greeks did not believe Transubstantiation.

Theophylact.

In Marcum.

c. 14.

In all probability Nicetas Pectoratus did not believe it, seeing Cardinal Humbert whom Pope Leo the 9th sent to them, upbraids him, Perfidious Stercoranist, says he to him, you think that the Participation of the Body and Blood of our Lord breaks the Fasts of Lent; and other holy Fasts, believing that the Heavenly, as well as the Terrestrial Food, is cast out into the draft, by the sordid and stinking way of the Belly.

Nicetas Pe-

ctoratus.

Humber. Tom.

4. Bibl. of the

Patr. Edit.

ult. 245.

Alger de Sacram. l. 2. c. 1. Tom. 6. of the Fathers, lib. and the Jesuit Cellor, in Append. Miscel. Opusc. 7. p. 564. do frequently impute this Error to the Greeks.

The Author of the Chronicle Malleacensis, on the year 1083, observes in the Monastery (Cormoriacensi), That there was a Fryar called Listerius, of such great Abstinence, that for Ten years time, he drank neither Wine nor Water, but what he received in the Sacrament; of necessity then, what one drinks in the Eucharist, must be true Wine, and true Water.

That the Authors of the TWELFTH CENTURY did not believe Transubstantiation.

Honorius Priest and Theologal of the Church of Rutan, did not believe Transubstantiation, seeing Thomas Waldensis, Tom. 2. c. 90. saith, That this Theologal was of the Sect of the Bread-eaters of Rabanus, de Secta Panitarum Rabani; and Honorius saith with Raban, that the Sacrament which is received with the Mouth, is

A G E xii.

Honorius.

An. 1120. In

Gemma Anim.

l. i. c. 111.

K

converte d

A G E xii.

Honorius.

† Ib. c. 63.

* Ib. c. 64.

‖ Ibid. c. 65.

converted into bodily food, but the Virtue of the Sacrament is that whereby the inward Man is fed and satisfied. He saith also, That the Host is broken, because the Bread of Angels was broken for us upon the Cross.

* That the Bishop bites one piece, that he divides it in parts, that it is not received whole, but broke in three parts, ‖ that when 'tis put in the Wine, it is shewed that the Soul of our Lord return'd to his Body, and he calls that which is broke, the Body of the Lord; then he observes, that the Sub-Deacon receives from the Deacon the Body of our Saviour, and that he carries it to the Priests to divide it to the People; all this can only be understood of the Bread, which is improperly called the Body.

Rupertus.

A. 1111.

Rupert Abbot of *Duits*, near *Cologne*, upon *Exodus*, l. 2: c. 10, saith, That the Holy Ghost doth not destroy the Substance of Bread, as he did not destroy the human Nature, when he joined it to the Word; and in his 6th Book on *St. John*, of the *Paris* Edition, in the year 1638, he saith, That as the Word was made Flesh, not being changed into Flesh, but in assuming Flesh, so also the Word made Flesh, is made visible Bread, not being changed into Bread, but taking and transferring the Bread into the Unity of his Person. We will say no more of this Author, because *Bellarmin* and several others, do freely confess that *Rupert* did not believe Transubstantiation; also *Honorius* of *Auster* gives him extraordinary Commendations, saying, That *Rupert* illuminated with a Vision of the Holy Ghost, explained almost all the Holy Scriptures in an Admirable stile.

De Scriptor.
Eccles. l. 3. c.
11. & 15.

De Script. Eccl.

Zonaras.

Tom. 6. Cyr.
Alex. in Notis
vulcani ad lib.
advers. An-
thropom. Zo-
nar. Ep. 2.

Zonaras in the East did not believe Transubstantiation, seeing he saith of the Eucharist, That it is a Shew-bread which is subject to Corruption, and which is eat and ground with the Teeth. *Paris Propositionis corruptioni est obnoxius, ut pote caro existens vere Christi, & secatur dentibus nostris, & molitur.* So that he was of the Opinion of *Damascen* and *Rupert*.

Francus.

The Abbot *Francus*, in all likelihood, Abbot of *Lobes*, did not approve the Opinion of Transubstantiation, seeing the *Cenurators* of *Magdebourg* observe, that he had no right Judgment of the Lords Supper, asserting that the true Body of Christ was not in the Holy Sacrament.

Amalaricus.

Amalaricus Bishop of *Chartres* in they ear 1107, a man of great Reputation for his Knowledge and Wisdom, saith *Gauguin* in his 6th Book of the History of France, in the Reign of *Philip the August*, amongst

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

489

amongst other things, denied Transubstantiation. Bernard of Luxemburg, Præstolus and Alphonsus alastro, report the same of Amaury, as also Genebrard in his Chronicle, Lib. 4. Anno 1215.

In Catal. in
Almar. contra
Hæres. Verb.
Euch. 4.

Opinions of Authors of the THIRTEENTH CENTURY,
and afterwards, touching Transubstantiation.

AGE xiii.

IT's true, Pope Innocent the 3^d, did condemn this Amaury at the Council of Lateran, after his Death, in the year 1215. but 'tis not said wherefore; and what was transacted in this Council, deserves not to be much regarded, if it be consider'd after what manner things were there transacted. The Pope, who then presided, was a man full of vain Glory and Ambition; Matthew Paris and Matthew of Westminster intimate so much of him, and that the liberty of voting and speaking was denied to the Prelates of the Assembly, for they were not seen to propose, nor deliberate, nor advise, nor prepare any of the Constitutions which were there in great numbers; but they were presented to the Council ready drawn up, it not appearing that the advice of the Assembly was taken on each of them, as is usually practis'd in all free and lawful Councils. Matthew Paris, on the year 1215, speaks in these terms, Every one being Assembled in the place abovesaid, and each having according to the custom of the General Councils, taken their place, the Pope having first made an Exhortatory Sermon, there was read in full Council Sixty Articles; which were liked by some, and disliked by others.

Godfrey a Fryer of St. Pantalion at Cologne, saith, There was nothing worth the remembrance done at this Council, only that the Eastern Church submitted to the Western, which before was never known. Naucerlus and Platina, in the Life of Innocent the 3^d. affirm the same, for they mark, that several things were there propos'd, but that nothing was clearly determin'd. And Kings and Princes have no Reason to allow of this Council, because in the 3^d Chap. of the said Council, Power is given to the Pope to deprive Princes and Lords of their Lands, and to give them to others.

Ad Ann. 1215.

Greg. le Gros Archbishop of Narbonne, in the year 1268, did not believe Transubstantiation; for being at Rome, and discovering his

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

mind to a certain Doctor, being return'd to *Narbonne*, Pope *Clement* the IV. wrote him a Letter, telling him that a certain Doctor inform'd him, that discoursing with him, he held that the Body of Christ was not essentially in the Sacrament, and no otherwise than as the thing signified is in the Sign; and that he said also this Opinion was common at *Paris*. This appears by the Register'd Manuscript of the Letters of *Clement* the IV. And to shew that the Arch Bishop of *Narbonne* said this Doctrine was very frequent at *Paris*; we find that two years after, that is to say, in the year 1270. which was in the year *St. Lewis* died; *Stephen* Bishop of *Paris*, by advice of some Doctors in Divinity, condemned those which held, that God cannot make an Accident to be without a Subject, because it is of its Essence to be actually in its Subject. 2/y, That the Accident without a Subject, is not evident, unless it be equivocal. 3/y, That to make the Accident subsist without its Subject, as we think it does in the Eucharist, is a thing impossible, and implies a Contradiction. 4/y, That God cannot make the Accident be without its Subject, neither that it should have several Dimensions. Which Maxims being inconsistent with *Transubstantiation*, doth plainly shew, that even at that time, Men were divided on the Subject of *Transubstantiation*. One *William*, saith the Fryer *Walsingham*, in the Life of *Richard* the 2d, King of England, on the year 1381. Preached at *Leicester* on Palm-Sunday, That the Sacrament of the Altar is real Bread after Consecration; and that the Bishop of *Lincoln* going to punish him for it, the People appearing concern'd for him, made the Bishop not dare do any thing against him, which doth plainly shew, that in that time the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* had not taken any deep root in the minds of the People.

In *Richard* 2. Anno 1282. *Reginald* Peacock Bishop of *Chichester* in England, in the year 1457, did not hold *Transubstantiation*, seeing *Baleus* reports on the Credit of *Thomas Gasconius* and *Leland*, that he had no sound thoughts touching the Eucharist, and that he asserted the Doctrine of *Wickliff*.

Now the Doctrine of *Wickliff*, as is related by this Frier *Walsingham* and *Thomas Waldensis*, was, That after Consecration by the Priest in the Mass, there remains true Bread and Wine, such as they were before; nevertheless, saith *Walsingham*, the Lords and Nobles of the Land favour'd *Wickliff*; which shews plainly, that the belief of *Transubstantiation* was not generally received.

Tbo. Waldens. in Epist. ad Mar. 5.

In Rich. 2.

Guy of Cluwoigny, Doctor in Divinity, of the Order of Carmelites, and Reader of the Sacred Palace, did not hold Transubstantiation, but held the Opinion of Rupert de Duits, to wit, the Impanation; and said, That this Opinion was so agreeable to him, that if he were Pope, he would establish it. Thomas Waldensis reports the same thing, having receiv'd it from John of Paris. It's certain that John of Paris teacheth so in his Manuscript Treatise in the Library of St. Victor, having for its Title, *Determinatio fratris Joannis de Parisiis Prædicatoris de modo existendi Corpus Christi in Sacramento Altaris alio quam sit ille quem tenet Ecclesia.* Tom. 2. Cb 64.

The same John de Paris wrote the Treatise above mention'd, about the year 1300. he was a Jacobin, and Doctor of the Sorbon; he held that the Eucharist is the Body of Christ, as Rupert de Duits, and Guy of Cluwoigny did, to wit, by Assumption, Jesus Christ having taken the Bread into the Unity of his Suppositum, as he took the human Nature into the Unity of his Person. And towards the end of the Manuscript it is said, That the faculty thought fit, that the manner of explaining the Eucharist, by Assumption of the Bread, or by Conversion, was a probable Opinion; but that neither the one nor the other was decided as a matter of Faith; and that whoever said otherwise, did not say well, and run the risque of Excommunication. In præsentia Collegii Magistrorum in Theologia dictum est; (says the end of the Manuscript) *utrumque modum ponendi Corpus Christi esse in Altare tenet pro Opinioni probabili, & approbat utrumque per. . . Et per dicta Sanctorum. Dicis tamen quod nullus est determinatus per Ecclesiam, & ideo nullus cadit sub fide, & si aliter dixisset, minus bene dixisset, & qui aliter dicunt minus bene dicunt, & qui determinate assereret alterum præcise cadere sub fide incurreret sententiam, Canonis vel Anathematis.* Thomas Waldensis attributes this Opinion to John de Paris.

There is commonly found in the Library of the Franciscan Friers, a Book called the Poor's Reckoning, writ by one, called De Geris, a Doctor of Tholouse, and Native of Arragon; he Dedicated his Book to Alphonfus of Arragon Arch-Bishop of Sarragossa. He chargeth John de Paris with the Opinion of the Impanation, and doth not condemn it. It is on the 41st Book of Sentences, Dist. 11. q. 3. The Continuator of William de Nangis, his Manuscript Chronicle in the Library of St. German de Pres, that John de Paris is stiled, * De Scrip. Doctor of great Knowledge and Learning. * Trybeminus and Au. Ecclesiæ. Har. le Mire, give him also the same Epithets. * Au. Buar.

An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation.

I observe, That in this Manuscript, *John de Paris* to confirm his Opinion, makes use of the Authority of the Master of the Sentences, in *4th Sent. Dist. 21.* (I take it to be *Dist. 12.*) as if the Master of the Sentences should there say, That the *Impanation* is a probable Opinion. He also cites to the same purpose, *Dominus Hostiensis*, &c. *Super Corpus juris extra de summa Trinit. & fide Cathol. C. firmiter Oredimus*, & *de Celebratione Missarum, cap. cum Marta.*

Albertus Magnus expounds the Eucharist by *Transubstantiation*, but he saith, *salvo Meliori judicio*, which shews that he did not believe it as of Faith.

Durandus of *St. Porciem* taught, that the substance of *Bread* Remain'd, but that the form was chang'd.

In 4. dist. 11.
Q. 3.

Durand in the 4. Sent. dist. 10. q. 13. saith, That in his time there were Catholick Doctors which taught, the *Bread* remain'd in the Eucharist, and did prove it by the Confession which *Berenger* was forc'd to make, affirming this opinion was not condemn'd.

Cornelius Bishop of *Bisonte*, declared against *Transubstantiation* in the Council of *Trent*; *Canus* *Locor. Theol. l. 12. c. 13.*

Disp. 49. Sect.
4. Disp. 9. Sect.
8.

Dominicus Bannes taught, that the Existence of *Bread* doth remain, that so the *Accidents* of *Bread* and *Vine* may remain by this Existence. At least *Suarez*, and *Mairas* attribute this opinion to him.

To all which, if we add the Doctors that we have mention'd in our first Part, that could not speak of *Transubstantiation* but as of a New Doctrine, and which could not be proved by the Scriptures, without intimating that they were not all satisfied with it; we shall see it plainly appears, that we cannot apply to the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, the Rule of *Vinc. etus Lirinenfis*, which is offer'd to us by the Bishops of *France*.

The CONCLUSION.

W Herefore the Bishops are humbly desired, That they would not continue to exercise so much rigor and severity against the Protestants of *France*, who having yielded farther than they well could with a safe Conscience, to obey the Kings Orders, yet cannot in any wise resolve to make any profession of the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, it appearing that they oppose it only for Conscience sake, and as being contrary to the very Rule offered to them by the Bishops themselves.

lf

If *St. Austin* could say, That those ought not to be esteemed *Hereticks* that with an honest mind maintained the Errors of their Ancestors, and are ready to relinquish them when they are better inform'd of the Truth; how much greater Reason is there to bear with People who do shew by the very confession of *Romish* Catholick Doctors, That the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is a new invention, and by consequence, that it ought not to be imposed as an Article of Faith, by the very Rule laid down by the Bishops of France.

No reasonable Person can find any question in matter of Religion whereto this Rule of *St. Austin's* can be more justly applied. For if it be not observ'd in this controversy of *Transubstantiation*, there will never be any thing found that it may be used in.

If then such Persons are not *Hereticks* for seeking the Truth, and that they think 'tis their duty to seek it; that they are of the judgment of Catholick Doctors, and that they observe the Rule prescribed by the Bishops; it is no way safe to persecute them to that degree of violence, to make them believe that which is contrary to the Rule which is laid down; and therefore, what is said by *St. Austin* on Psalm 54. should seriously be consider'd, *Plerumque cum tibi videris Odisse inimicum, fratrum odisti, & nescis.*

FINIS.

William 173835 Walker

ADDENDA.

THESE words in their place, are also to be added. The heavenly Sacrament which truly represents the flesh of Jesus Christ, is called the Body of Christ, but improperly; and nevertheless it is so called after its manner, not according to the truth of the thing, but by a significant Mystery; so that the meaning is, 'tis called the Body of Jesus Christ, that is to say, that the Body is thereby signified. And also the Text of the Canon taken out of *St. Austin*; *Sicut Caelestis panis qui Christi caro est, suo modo vocatur Corpus Christi, cum re vera sit Sacramentum Corporis Christi, id est, videlicet quod visibile, palpabile, mortale, &c.*

The Gloss on the Canon be-
est, in the 2.
dist. of the
Consecrat.
De consen. 2.